SEMINARIUM RELIGIONIS PACIFICAE
CONDITUM AD 1961
PRO
VERITATE
ET
REGNO
DEI
CHARLES HOLBROOK LIBRARY
Pacific School of Religion

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2025 with funding from
Graduate Theological Union

https://archive.org/details/universityparish00unse

THE UNIVERSITY PARISH PASTOR

A National Study of the Functions of the Preaching Pastor
At a College or University Methodist Church
As They Relate to Student Life in
The United States

by

Donald Swarthout Fleming

B. A. (Oklahoma City University) 1928
B. D. (Garrett Biblical Institute) 1931
Th. M. (Berkeley Baptist Divinity School) 1952

GRADUATE THEOLOGICAL UNION
LIBRARY
1962

DISSERTATION

Submitted to the Department of Religion in Higher Education
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for
the degree of Doctor of Theology
in the
Pacific School of Religion

HOLBROOK LIBRARY
PACIFIC SCHOOL
OF RELIGION

May, 1961

69341

BX
8345
F53
1961

APPROVED BY

Charles S. McCoy (First Reader)

Georgia Harkness (Second Reader)

Calvin J. Sutherlin

Wayne R. Rood

Vere V. Loper

Committee in Charge

Deposited in the Holbrook Library _____ _____
(date) (librarian)

HOLBROOK LIBRARY
PACIFIC SCHOOL
OF RELIGION

PREFACE

Basic to the desire of every sincere preacher of the gospel is a genuine longing to communicate the good news as effectively as possible to those who look to him for spiritual guidance.

This is particularly true of the pastor of a Methodist Church in a college or university parish where such a pastor is obligated to preach and to serve students in a manner that is relevant to the needs of a university community.

This study is essentially concerned with the motives, the methods, and the practices of such a university parish pastor as he relates to students in the university community. This study is not primarily about students (although the writer hopes that the end-result of the study will be a better ministry to them). It is not a study of the Wesley Foundation, nor is it a study of the Wesley Foundation Director. It is not fundamentally a study about university pastors, college chaplains, or campus co-ordinators of religion. It is not primarily an analysis of the university or of the shifting predicament presented by problems of modern higher education. Nor is it a blueprint for the Methodist Student Movement or for recent actions of the General Conference emphasizing Christian higher education. It is none of the foregoing, although it is related to all of them.

This study is about preachers--preaching Methodist pastors in the university parish church. In keeping with the title of the dissertation,

the study will be limited to the functions of these pastors as they relate to student life in the United States.

This study will not be concerned with the ordinary pastoral functions through which the average Methodist pastor relates to the parishioners of a normal parish. It will not deal with all of the routine duties which every minister of the gospel expects to perform as he ministers to the needs of his congregation. In necessarily limiting the scope of this study the writer acknowledges that the total ministry of the university church to the academic community is more inclusive than the relation of the pastor to student life. He is also aware that the overall ministry of the university parish pastor normally is concerned with a much larger area of activity than serving students. Therefore, since this study will be concerned with only a portion of the total ministerial obligation of the university parish pastor to the university community, he asks the reader continually to bear in mind throughout the reading of this dissertation that the problem to which this study is addressed constitutes only a segment of the church's larger ministry to the academic community.

This study is based on the presuppositions that the university parish pastor has a unique ministry to perform to students, that he exercises certain specific functions in his relation to student life which are peculiar to the university community, and that he needs special training for optimum exercise of these functions.

This is an original study conceived in the mind of the writer when he was appointed pastor to a near-campus Methodist church in a state university setting. When he arrived on the scene he found little evidence of a program of student work being carried on in the local church. Only a

vague delineation of the meaning of "university community" was discernible, and Methodist student work on the campus was practically nonexistent. There was no Wesley Foundation or student group organized to meet the needs of hundreds of Methodist students on the adjacent campus, and virtually no attempt had been made on the part of the congregation to encourage student participation in the worship services or other activities of the local church. There was no associate pastor or trained assistant on the staff, and there was no immediate prospect for the employment of a professionally trained student worker. It was a "single-pastor" situation where the preacher had to depend entirely upon voluntary lay leadership for limited aid in carrying on a program for students.

Immediately the question was born in the mind of the writer, "How can I serve students better?"

To discover the answer to this question he found that he had to start from the very beginning. What meager help he was able to secure at first proved inadequate. Aside from counsel offered by the Department of College and University Religious Life of the Board of Education at Nashville, Tennessee, there were no written texts to tell the preaching pastor at a near-campus church how to relate to students.

By trial and error, and at the cost of considerable time and energy expended in the "plowing of new ground," Methodist student work on the campus was organized and the writer's ministry to the university community developed a pattern.

From the first the writer was grateful for help made available by study of the Wesley Foundation and other organizations that are designed

to serve students. But he was appalled that there had been little or no effort on the part of anyone to analyze the problems, the needs, and the answers of Methodist ministers who relate to students as they serve near-campus churches across the nation.

The writer kept asking himself, "Who are these university parish pastors? What do they do when they are confronted with these particular problems in relation to student work? Are they not groping in the dark for the same answers to the same problems as I?"

When he learned that there were more than 600 such pastors in Methodist churches located in college and university communities whose training and experience required them to preach in a manner that is relevant to the needs of college students, he asked himself, "Why cannot their corporate answers to the problems of student work be pooled for the aid of the pastors concerned, as well as for the enrichment of the religious life of thousands of Methodist students and their companions on the campuses of American institutions of higher learning?"

This question eventually became the basis for a questionnaire distributed to the preaching pastors of 422 near-campus churches in the United States, as listed in the Directory of the Methodist Student Movement furnished by the Department of College and Religious Life of the Board of Education of the Methodist Church. And the questionnaire became the chief instrument for this study.

In preparation for this study the writer has read widely in the expanding library of literature that is published in the area of Religion in Higher Education. He is a graduate of a specialized course of study and formal training designed for Wesley Foundation directors and professional

Methodist student workers in which he enrolled so that he might gain insight into these vocations and obtain information which might be helpful in this study. The course was taught by Dr. Hiel D. Bollinger, who has been associated with the Department of College and University Religious Life of the Board of Education of The Methodist Church for more than quarter of a century--and who probably knows more about the training of Wesley Foundation directors and Methodist professional student workers than any other single individual. While enrolled in this course the writer was able to learn at first hand about many of the problems that are involved in student work and how the professional worker deals with them on the field. While doing research for this course of study the seed for the writing of this dissertation germinated. The writer also attended a summer session of the Yale School of Alcohol Studies. Information received from this special study has been valuable in counseling with students about the problem of alcohol and in gaining insight into the current status of drinking on the campus.

Additional background was gained through two years of graduate work at the Pacific School of Religion at Berkeley, California. During this period of resident study full time was devoted to four areas of research with the idea of using content, bibliography, and interaction with faculty and students as basic material for this study. These courses included several earned hours of work under the direction of Dr. Clarence P. Shedd, recognized authority in the field of Religion in Higher Education, a thorough review of what contemporary seminary students are learning in the department of Christian Theology, a number of advanced courses in the department of Religious Education, and several courses in

Pastoral Counseling. The latter included a term of institutional clinical counseling under supervision which has proved helpful in the writing of certain sections of this dissertation.

An abundance of background knowledge was also gained by the writer through his experience as a university parish pastor at Methodist Churches adjacent to two state universities. During his association with students and the university community at these stations the outline for this study kept growing. During his ten years of pastoral experience in such a university setting he has interviewed a number of university parish pastors, Wesley Foundation directors, and professional student workers across the nation. He has also talked with a host of mature college and seminary youth who have reflected valuable contributions.

No systematic attempt was made to catalogue the findings of these interviews or to summarize the results of this experience. Extensive reading notes were taken, however, and an orderly procedure was followed in attempting to use the knowledge secured in the aforementioned methods for filling in gaps in information, for appraising work being done on the field, and for gathering further insight on problems confronted by university parish pastors as they relate to students. A varied mass of this background material eventually was used to supplement information derived from the questionnaire.

The reader should understand that not every aspect of the problem posed by this dissertation can be measured or evaluated within the limitations of time and space. Many avenues which undoubtedly might produce valuable findings will have to remain unexplored. During this presentation the writer will portray the relationship between the factors or

variables indicated by the gathered facts in an objective fashion without attempting to defend any previously formed hope or pre-conceived convictions. He will try to present facts and interpret results as fairly and as impartially as possible, strictly according to the tabulation of the data observed.

While the dissertation will begin with a definite hypothesis, it will not be argued according to commitments made in advance. If the writer is determined about any one thing, it is that the facts shall speak for themselves. They must be trusted.

The writer is aware of the natural tendency of some Methodist preachers to be "enthusiastic" and resultantly inaccurate as they reply to questions involving statistics and their own personal feelings of ego, prestige, status, guilt, etc. This frequently leads to misrepresentation of facts. So far as possible, replies from pastors will be evaluated with due allowance for such discrepancy.

To the knowledge of the writer this is the first and only study of its kind concerning the problems confronting preaching pastors who are ministering to students at near-campus Methodist churches in college communities. The writer profoundly hopes that the findings presented here may become the key which can be used by the university parish pastor to open several locked doors so that he may become a better minister to students.

The writer is extremely grateful to his 224 colleagues in the field who spent considerable time in answering the questions asked in the seven page questionnaire which provided a substantial portion of the

data used in the study. Without their keen interest and willing cooperation the project would have failed.

To Dr. Hiel Bollinger, director of the Department of College and University Religious Life of the Board of Education of The Methodist Church, teacher and friend of students for more than a quarter of a century, who carefully directed the author's initial research and shared his dream of the completion of this study, the writer owes more than he can acknowledge in words.

He is also deeply indebted to Dr. Clarence P. Shedd, visiting professor of Religion in Higher Education at the Pacific School of Religion from 1957 to 1959, who offered perspective, stimulation, encouragement, major direction, and important collaboration in designing the instrument for this study.

In no small measure he is indebted to Dr. Charles S. McCoy, who became professor Religion in Higher Education at the Pacific School of Religion in 1959. As first reader he has given generously of his time and made many valuable suggestions and helpful criticisms during the writing of this thesis from Chapter One to Conclusion.

The writer would be remiss if he did not include an acknowledgement of his obligation to the entire faculty and the administrative officers of the Pacific School of Religion for their warm interest, fraternal guidance, and genuine concern during his residence there. He is especially grateful to Dr. Georgia Harkness, second reader, for valuable criticism, encouragement, and many helpful suggestions which are reflected in the finished manuscript. The assistance of Professor Albert Rasmussen, who made suggestions regarding the statistical implications of the

findings, as well as tabulation of results and their essential correlation, is also appreciated. And the assistance of Dr. Calvin Sutherlin in constructive criticism and in suggesting that the findings of the study be tabulated by jurisdictions proved to be an invaluable contribution.

The writer cannot fully express his gratitude to the other members of his doctoral committee for their keen interest, discerning directives and discriminating disciplines, as well as for their understanding counsel while this manuscript was being scribed. He feels particularly indebted to Dr. Robert Leslie, Dr. Wayne Rood, and Dr. Harkness for inspiration and cooperation beyond the call of duty while doing graduate research in their respective department of Pastoral Counseling, Religious Education, and Christian Theology. He is also aware that he owes much of the success of this study to interaction and creative fellowship with undergraduate classmates at the Pacific School of Religion during the fulfilling of residential requirements.

A note of genuine appreciation should be included concerning the helpful cooperation of Bishop Donald Harvey Tippett and the Cabinet of the California-Nevada Conference of The Methodist Church who graciously allowed the writer to be "left without appointment to attend school" during his residence at the Pacific School of Religion.

Finally, the writer is more indebted than he can ever repay to his wife, Delia Mills Fleming, without whose sympathetic understanding, wholehearted encouragement and patient sharing this work might have died aborning.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

PREFACE ii

LIST OF TABLES. xv

PART I. BACKGROUND

Chapter

I. INTRODUCTION: PROBLEM AND PROJECTION 2

A. The Problem
B. Projection of the Hypothesis
C. Outline of the Dissertation

II. THE DILEMMA OF CONTEMPORARY HIGHER EDUCATION. 11

A. A Widening Gulf
B. Crisis in the University
C. The Pendulum Swings Back
D. Signs of a Renaissance of Religion on Campus
E. Summary

III. WHO IS THE CONTEMPORARY COLLEGE STUDENT 31

A. One View of the Student--A Picture of Despair
B. Another View of the Student--A Picture of Hope
C. Summary

IV. THE METHODIST CHURCH FOLLOWS ITS STUDENTS 51

A. The History of Methodist Higher Education
B. The Rise of the Student Christian Movement
C. Beginnings of Denominational Student Programs
D. The Methodist Student Movement
E. The Philosophy of Methodist Student Work
F. The General Conference Quadrennial Emphasis
G. General Conference Action for Present Quadrennium
H. The Key Role of the University Parish Pastor
I. Summary

V. THE IDEAL UNIVERSITY PARISH PASTOR: QUALIFICATIONS . . . 90

A. General Qualifications
B. Formal Training
C. Some Additional Helps
D. Summary

Chapter | Page

VI. THE IDEAL UNIVERSITY PARISH PASTOR: FUNCTIONS 110

A. Primary Specific Functions

1. Preaching
2. Counseling
3. Teaching
4. Evangelism
5. Administration

B. Summary

PART II. THE INSTRUMENT: PROCEDURE AND ANALYSIS

VII. PROCEDURE 151

A. Procedure With the Questionnaire
B. Analysis of Statistical Returns
C. Summary

VIII. THE QUESTIONNAIRE 176

A. Page One: Institutional and General Data
B. Page Two: Plant, Program and Pastoral Relationships
C. Page Three: The Preaching Function
D. Page Four: The Counseling Function
E. Page Five: The Teaching Function
F. Page Six: The Evangelism Function
G. Page Seven: The Administration Function

IX. ANALYSIS OF DATA RETURNED FROM QUESTIONNAIRE: INSTITUTIONAL AND GENERAL DATA 204

A. The Data Analyzed
B. Summary

X. ANALYSIS OF QUESTIONNAIRE CONTINUED: PLANT, PROGRAM AND PASTORAL RELATIONSHIPS 225

A. The Data Analyzed
B. Summary

XI. ANALYSIS OF QUESTIONNAIRE CONTINUED: THE PREACHING FUNCTION 250

A. The Data Analyzed
B. Summary

Chapter

Page

XII. ANALYSIS OF QUESTIONNAIRE CONTINUED: THE COUNSELING FUNCTION 272

A. The Data Analyzed
B. Summary

XIII. ANALYSIS OF QUESTIONNAIRE CONTINUED: THE TEACHING FUNCTION 302

A. The Data Analyzed
B. Summary

XIV. ANALYSIS OF QUESTIONNAIRE CONTINUED: THE EVANGELISM FUNCTION 333

A. The Data Analyzed
B. Summary

XV. ANALYSIS OF QUESTIONNAIRE CONTINUED: THE ADMINISTRATION FUNCTION 369

A. The Data Analyzed
B. Summary

XVI. SOME SIGNIFICANT CROSS-TABULATIONS 407

A. Correlation of the Records of 31 "Older" Pastors and 31 "Younger" Pastors
B. Correlation of 16 Pastors with Special Training and 16 Pastors Without Special Training in Student Work
C. Correlation of 22 Pastors Who Teach and 22 Pastors Wo Do Not Teach College Credit Courses
D. Correlation of 21 Pastors Whose Students Do Considerable Visitation Enlistment and 21 Pastors Whose Students Do No Visitation Enlistment
E. Correlation of 16 Pastors Whose Churches Have Campus-Church Relations Committee and 16 Pastors Whose Churches Do Not Have the Committee
F. Summary of Cross-Tabulations

PART III. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

XVII. GENERAL SUMMARY AND CONCLUDING OBSERVATIONS. 459

A. General Summary
B. Comparison of the Typical Pastor and the Ideal Pastor
C. A Conclusion Concerning the Hypothesis
D. A Conclusion Concerning the Cross-Tabulations

Chapter Page
XVIII. EVALUATION AND CONCLUSION 482

A. Evaluation of the Study
B. Concluding Suggestions and Recommendations

1. Some Functional Recommendations
2. An Extended Study of Campus Evangelism
3. A Parallel Study for Junior Colleges
4. A Plan for Specialized Training
5. A Recommendation to Bishops and Cabinets
6. Recommendation to the Council of Bishops
7. Continued Emphasis on Christian Higher Education
8. The Publication of a Handbook on This Study

BIBLIOGRAPHY 509

APPENDIX 517

A. Accompanying Letters and Questionnaire Sent to Pastors for First Mailing of the Instrument
B. Letter Enclosed with Second Mailing of Questionnaire
C. Accompanying Letter and Final Questionnaire for Sampling of "No-Returns"

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
1.	Distribution by States	159
2.	Distribution by Jurisdictions	159
3.	Number of Instruments Returned	162
4.	Rejected Instruments	165
5.	Valid Instruments Returned	170
6.	Sampling of the "No-Returns"	171
7.	Membership of 224 Churches Served by University Parish Pastors in the United States	205
8.	Classification of Institutions Involved	207
9.	Enrollment Statistics of Related Schools	209
10.	Methodist-Preference Students and College Enrollments	211
11.	Relation of Methodist-Preference Students to Church	214
12.	Percentage of Methodist-Preference Students Reached and Enrolled by Parish Church	215
13.	Types of Student Organizations in the Local Parish Church	217
14.	Average Attendance of Students at Sunday Morning Worship	219
15.	Analysis of Service Records	227
16.	Number of Campus-Related Churches Served by Respondents	229
17.	Academic Degrees of Pastors Involved	230
18.	Formal Courses in Student Work	233
19.	Pastors Willing to Take Training	235
20.	Tabulation of Distance Factor	240
21.	How Advisers Were Selected	245
22.	Relative Importance of Sermon Types	251
23.	Degree of Relationship Between Preaching and Counseling	255
24.	The Pastor's Preaching Methods	257
25.	How Much Preaching is Slanted at Students	258
26.	Reactions of Students to Preaching	264
27.	How Much Preaching is Related to Counseling	274
28.	Publication of Pastor's Hours for Counseling and Average Number of Hours of Counseling per Week per Pastor	276
29.	Sources of Counseling Situations	283

Table		Page
30.	Pastors Teaching Courses or Groups	304
31.	How Students Participate in Church Activities	313
32.	Student Official Board Members	316
33.	Estimates of Required Knowledge of Education	318
34.	Complaints on Legal Grounds by Jurisdictions	321
35.	Availability of Methodist-Preference Registrations	334
36.	How Pastors Encourage Student Membership	340
37.	How Student Members are Listed on Roll	343
38.	Evangelism Score of 18 Northeastern Pastors as they Relate to Students	347
39.	Relative Importance of Evangelism Methods	349
40.	Schools Offering Religious Emphasis Week	354
41.	Visitation Evangelism and "Revivalism"	356
42.	Opinions About Evangelistic Emphasis	358
43.	How Local Parish Methodist Churches Relate to Students through Committees	371
44.	Amount of Student-Work Budgets	380
45.	How Much Local Pastors are Responsible for Financing Student Work	382
46.	How Much Local Pastors Bear Responsibility for Student Work Public Relations	385
47.	Pastor's Relationships to Faculty Organizations	389
48.	How Much Pastors Participate in Other Ways	393
49.	Opinions of Pastors About Appointment to University Parish Pulpits	398
50.	Records of 31 "Older" and 31 "Younger" Pastors	411
51.	Records of 31 "Older" and 31 "Younger" Pastors Continued	416
52.	Records of 31 "Older" and 31 "Younger" Pastors Continued	422
53.	Number of Students Reached by 16 Pastors With and Without Specialized Training for Student Work	427
54.	Number of Students Reached by 16 Pastors With and Without Specialized Training for Student Work, Continued	430

Table

Page

55. Number of Students Reached by 16 Pastors With and Without Specialized Training for Student Work, Continued 434

56. Comparison of Records of 22 Pastors Who Teach College Credit Courses with Records of Pastors Who Do Not Teach 437

57. Comparison of Records of 21 Pastors Whose Students Do Considerable and No Visitation Membership Enlistment. 442

58. Comparison of Records of Pastors 16 With and Without Campus-Church Relation Committees 447

PART I

BACKGROUND

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION: PROBLEM AND PROJECTION

The Methodist Church was born in a college and has had a stake in higher education ever since.

From its inception late in the eighteenth century Methodism has emphasized the importance of an educated clergy as well as an informed laity.[1] Since the founding of the first American academy for higher education in Virginia in 1748 (Ebenezer), The Methodist Church has sired and nurtured a total of 136 educational institutions which are scattered across the United States from Florida to Alaska.[2]

Following the Civil War a rapid growth of state universities, independent schools and tax-supported institutions of higher learning kept pace with a boom in the birth-rate of church-related colleges. Today one out of every three youths of college age is attending an institution of higher learning. About half the college students in America are enrolled in tax-supported institutions. The remaining fifty per cent are scattered among the independent, church-related, and privately owned schools. According to the Office of Education of the United States

---

[1] Murray H. Leiffer, Methodist Student Work at the Colleges of Arizona, California, and Nevada (Upland, Indiana: A. D. Freese and Sons, 1951), p. 77.

[2] Directory of Educational Institutions of The Methodist Church, leaflet No. 1073-E1, issued by the Director of Information and Publications of the Division of Educational Institutions of the Board of Education of The Methodist Church, Box 871, Nashville, Tennessee, p. 2.

Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, the fall enrollment of full and part time college students for the scholastic year 1960-61 reached an all time high of 3,610,107. And there are in the judgment of experts valid grounds for expecting as many as 5,000,000 or even 6,000,000 by 1970.

A. The Problem

Of this number in 1959 it was estimated that 544,368 students, or approximately sixteen per cent, belonged to or preferred The Methodist Church.[1] In order to provide spiritual guidance to this host of Methodist students on the campuses of all types of American colleges, there are approximately 600 Methodist churches located adjacent to these schools where pastors are preaching to students and university communities.[2]

Ideally, the pastors of these near-campus churches require peculiar training and experience to qualify them to preach and to serve their communities in a manner that is relevant to the college and university community.[3] For a number of years the Methodist Church has been aware of the problems of its pastors at university parish churches and has tried to help them. It has made available a number of useful tools

---

[1]Information supplied by the Department of College and University Religious Life of the Division of Educational Institutions of the Board of Education of The Methodist Church.

[2]Professional Student Christian Work in The Methodist Church, a leaflet published by the Department of College and University Religious Life of the Division of Higher Education of the Board of Education of The Methodist Church, Box 871, Nashville, Tennessee.

[3]Ibid.

to aid them in their ministry to students. Chief among these is the provision at many campus situations of a Wesley Foundation director, or a professional student worker.

But literally there are hundreds of smaller college situations in America (and this is becoming increasingly true with the development of junior colleges and vocational schools throughout the country) where, because of small size and other limitations, the parish pastors have no professional student worker to help them. They are heavily burdened with pastoral routine demanded by a local church. Nevertheless they have students and faculty in their congregation who require a peculiar type of ministry for which they need a peculiar training and experience.

In the beginning it was the hope of the writer to aim this study at these contemporary pastors who serve Methodist near-campus churches whose constituency is of such size and nature as to make it impossible for them to have the help of a Wesley Foundation director or an associate staff-member assigned to student work. But most of the ministers serving the single-pastor situations, who probably need the aid of this kind of a study more than others, failed to reply to the questionnaires sent to them.

Therefore, in light of the fact that a preponderance of data in answer to the questionnaires were returned by pastors whose churches have professional associates or assistants in charge of student work, the writer thought that it was necessary to shift the aim of the study from the minister serving the single-pastor situation to the minister serving a near-campus church without regard to the size of the staff. It is profoundly hoped by the writer, however, that many of the conclusions

resulting from observation of data returned in this study will apply to the single-pastor situation and be helpful to ministers who labor at such a university parish church.

In this study the writer attempted to analyze the problems, the needs, and the answers of university parish pastors as they relate to students and university communities in the United States. Also he attempted to discover the similarities and differences, the strength and weaknesses which point up central problems faced by the university parish pastor. As a result of this study proposals will be made for strengthening the hand of this pastor and the local campus-related church in their ministry to students.

As a result of this study a sketch or portrait was drawn of the university parish pastor as one of the instruments provided by The Methodist Church for "following its students" to the campus. The study attempted to answer such questions as: Who is the Methodist university parish pastor? What kind of a job is he doing? What are his opportunities, limitations, and responsibilities? How can he serve students better? What is his proper role as he relates to students, faculty, administration and the entire university community?

In exploring these questions it was the desire of the writer to throw light on a centrally important phase of the university parish pastor's ministry to the campus.

In brief, this study is an attempt to discover the role and the functions of the university parish pastor as he relates to student life in the United States, and through such a discovery to find some suggestions as to how the ministry of this pastor might be enhanced. It is

the hypothesis of this study that the prototypes or models of the ideal university parish pastor and the typical or average university parish pastor who labor in the field can be projected, that their performances can be compared and contrasted, and that as a result of this procedure useful information will be discovered that can help the pastor who serves such a church to increase the proficiency and the effectiveness of his ministry to student life.

B. Projection of the Hypothesis

The hypothesis was developed and tested accordingly:

Following introductory chapters which presented essential background material describing the contemporary dilemma in higher education, the writer presented a picture of the contemporary student mind and its shifting sense of values. He also made an attempt to establish religion in higher education as the key which will unlock many answers in both of these areas. Against such a setting the problem involving the needs of Methodist students was raised, and the question was asked, "In light of such a setting, what are the ramifications of the thesis as they apply to Methodist pastors?"

Then the question, "What makes the relationship of the university parish pastor to students unique, as differentiated from the normal relationship to parishioners of a non-college congregation?" was explored. This relationship was necessarily limited and catalogued according to five functions which are peculiar to his office; namely, preaching, counseling, teaching, evangelism, and administration.

The prototype of the ideal university parish pastor was then projected according to the five peculiar functions which are exercised by this pastor as he relates to student life. The prototype was projected

from the experience of the writer after ten years in the field as university parish pastor at the scene of two state universities, out of a background of two years of graduate research in the department of Religion in Higher Education at the Pacific School of Religion when he did wide reading in this area, and after countless conversations and personal interviews with expert observers, fellow university parish pastors and graduate students who are interested in the problems of religion in higher education.

In order to fashion a composite picture of the typical or average university parish pastor who is laboring on the field (for comparing and contrasting with the ideal pastor), a seven page questionnaire was sent to 422 pastors stationed at near-campus churches listed in the directory of the Methodist Student Movement.[1] A total of 224 valid instruments, or a reply of 53.3 per cent, were returned for tabulation.

From an analysis of returns of the questionnaire a composite picture of a typical or average university parish pastor as he functions on the field in relation to student life was projected. The image of this "typical" pastor was then compared and contrasted with the image of the "ideal" pastor and the following questions were posed: To what degree does the "typical" pastor measure up to the "ideal" pastor? What are his strengths and weaknesses? In the light of this study how can the ministry of the contemporary university parish pastor be enhanced as he relates to student life? What are the prospects for the future? What further areas of inquiry are opened by this study?

---

[1] Directory of The Methodist Student Movement, a publication issued by the Department of College and University Religious Life of the Division of Educational Institutions of the Board of Education of The Methodist Church (Nashville: 1959). Cited hereafter as the Directory.

Salient factors revealed in the data were classified and observed. The hypothesis was tested and its validity qualified, so far as possible, by relation between the various factors or variables indicated by the gathered facts. Facts were confirmed when possible. Observations were made, and conclusions were drawn from judicious interpretation.

The study was concluded with a discovery of the validity of the hypothesis, some significant cross-tabulation of data, a summary statement, and observations and conclusions.

Although this study is essentially concerned with university parish pastors, the operative functions of these pastors necessarily involve students, colleges and religion. In fact, these four factors (pastors, students, colleges, and religion) are found in this study to be so mutually inter-related that every one of them must be carefully considered if a true picture is to be obtained. Not one of them can rightfully be ignored. Any attempt to make a satisfactory analysis of the university parish pastor's job demands intelligent inquiry and diligent observation of them all. Moreover, it is logical to assume that they should not be considered separately one from another, but in toto, as each relates to the other and to the whole.

Therefore, it would seem reasonable to presume that an adequate perspective of the study calls for careful preliminary consideration of all of these involved factors.

C. Outline of the Dissertation

In order to establish such a background for the study proposed by this dissertation, these factors will be previewed in the opening chapters: (1) colleges, (2) students, and (3) pastors. The final

factor, (4) religion, will be considered whenever its relationship is interwoven with the other factors and with the total problem.

Introductory background chapters in Part I of the dissertation were designated as follows: (1) The Dilemma of Contemporary Higher Education; (2) Who is the Contemporary College Student?; (3) The Methodist Church Follows its Students; (4) The Qualifications of the Ideal University Parish Pastor; and (5) The Functions of the Ideal University Parish Pastor. The first chapter will deal with an important question faced by educators and administrators in the realm of general education. The second chapter will be concerned with a glimpse into the mind of the contemporary student with regard to his shifting sense of values. The third chapter will demonstrate a plan whereby the Methodist university parish pastor may fit into the picture of a total ministry to the university community. The fourth chapter will establish the qualifications of a model university parish pastor. And the final chapter of this preliminary section will define the peculiar functions of the university parish pastor as he relates to students.

Part II of the dissertation was designed to present the questionnaire as the basic instrument used in the study, to analyze data returned in response to information requested on the seven pages of the instrument, and to offer for consideration a series of cross-tabulations with the hope of discovering creative findings.

In Part III of the dissertation the writer intended to review the data reported by participating respondents, and to review the procedure followed in the study. It was also his intent to present a resume of the performance of the typical pastor in comparison and contrast to the performance of the hypothetically projected ideal pastor.

In this review the writer hoped to discover whether the prototype of the ideal pastor had been satisfactorily projected to serve as a model against which to measure the actual performance of the university parish pastor in the field as he relates to student life, and thus validate the first claim of the hypothesis.

Then the writer intended to correlate the similarities and the differences between the typical or average pastor and the projected "ideal" pastor in light of pertinent data received from all possible sources. Following such a correlation the writer would attempt to determine the degree to which the "typical" pastor measures up to the standard established by the "ideal" pastor. In this section of the dissertation the writer hoped to be able to demonstrate that as a result of this procedure useful information would be produced that can help the pastor at a university parish church to become more proficient and effective in his ministry to student life. Thus, the final major claim of the hypothesis would be validated.

In conclusion, the writer will present an evaluation of the study and attempt to discover whether a learning situation has taken place and new knowledge discovered. He will present some concluding suggestions and recommendations for continued study and further exploration.

In the final chapter the writer will draw conclusions that are based upon observation of assembled data and rooted in the basic material that will have been presented in the dissertation.

In Chapter II the writer will begin a presentation of background material which is essential to an understanding of the study.

CHAPTER II

THE DILEMMA OF CONTEMPORARY HIGHER EDUCATION

During the first third of the twentieth century a gulf appeared to be widening between the aims of contemporary education and original goals of the past. The appearance of this gap alarmed a number of educators and observers who declared it to be a crisis. It will be the purpose of this chapter to survey this evident discrepancy as it relates to the problem of the dissertation, thus establishing background for a more enlightening consideration of the problem in later chapters.

A. A Widening Gulf

That there appears to be a growing cleavage separating intellectual from spiritual life is probably the most ominous defect of modern civilization. The implications of this cleavage have been dramatically spotlighted by the publication of a letter recently received by Mr. Adlai Stevenson from John Steinbeck. The letter was penned following the noted author's reading and reflections upon the headlines of a morning daily. In his letter Steinbeck comments:

> Two impressions. First, a creeping, all pervading, nerve-gas of immorality which starts in the nursery and does not stop before it reaches the highest offices, both corporate and governmental. Two, a nervous restlessness, a hunger, a thirst, a yearning for something unknown--perhaps morality . . .
>
> Adlai, I am troubled by the cynical immorality of my country. I do not think it can survive on this basis and unless some kind of catastrophe strikes us, we are lost. But by our very attitudes we are drawing catastrophe to ourselves. What we have beaten in nature, we cannot conquer in ourselves.

> Someone has to reinspect our system and that soon. We can't expect to raise our children to be good and honorable men when the city, the state, the government, the corporations all offer higher rewards for chicanery and deceit than for probity and truth. On all levels it's rigged, Adlai . . .[1]

That ours is a "rigged morality" and that there is a rising mountain of evidence attesting that these are times of confusion and doubt for moral authority and direction is the consensus of an increasing number of observers of American life. Chief among these observers is Sir Walter Moberly who more than a decade ago declared that western civilization is facing a moral, spiritual and cultural crisis which is based on its refusal to transmit from generation to generation the religious and classical culture of our western heritage.[2]

Moberly accuses modern educators of detaching public education from time-honored Judeo-Christian revealed religion--upon which, he claims, our western culture rests and depends for survival--until the public school is no longer spiritually oriented to the God of Judeo-Christian revelation. As a result, according to Moberly's reasoning, the personal biblical concept of God which was evident in the original foundations of education rapidly is being superseded by a man-made god that desperately needs the Christian virtues but fundamentally denies their supernatural origin and historic validity.

B. Crisis in the University

Moberly continues his alarming analysis of present day world situations in which he is sure that mankind threatens to destroy itself

---

[1] John Steinbeck and Adlai Stevenson, "Our Rigged Morality," Coronet (March 1960), pp. 146-147.

[2] Sir Walter Moberly, The Crisis in the University (London: SCM Press Ltd., 1949), pp. 15ff.

as it dwells "in the midst of uncertainties and on the edge of an abyss" by insisting that the present world crisis and its pervading sense of physical, moral, and spiritual insecurity are reflected in the present crisis in the university.[1] "What is wrong with them [the universities] is closely connected with what is wrong with the whole world,"[2] says Moberly. And he adds, "The universities are not now discharging their former central task."[3]

In support of this so-called "crisis theory," George F. Thomas, noted educator of Princeton University, writes:

> The issues at stake are great. If the moral breakdown and spiritual crises of our time are not to destroy our western civilization, if the secularism which has dominated our education is not to rob our American democracy of its higher meaning and to stunt and dehumanize the lives of our children and their children, we must renew our religious faith and make it the basis of all our teaching.[4]

All of this points up the present day dilemma in higher education. That there has been a change in the original aim and purpose of the university is true. The development of technocracy and the expansion of the sciences and vocational training have sharply altered the course of higher education. Philosophy and religion, which at one time constituted the core of the college curriculum, are now perceived as peripheral. Literature and the finer arts have been subordinated to a rising stress

---

[1] Ibid., p. 1.

[2] Ibid., p. 7.

[3] Ibid., p. 22.

[4] George F. Thomas, Religious Perspectives in College Teaching, ed. Hoxie Fairchild (New York: Ronald Press, 1952), p. 38.

in an atomic age on the physical sciences, engineering, business, and technical training.[1]

George A. Buttrick, in his volume titled Faith and Education, testifies to the widening gap between what the concept of the university was at the turn of the century and what it is today when he reminds his readers that, "The fine original meaning of college, c o l l e g i u m, both in England and America, was Christian faith . . ."[2] Moberly quotes from Rashdall's The University of Europe in the Middle Ages to the effect that in medieval days the universities were linked with the Papacy and the Empire "as being the outstanding representatives of the three parallel powers or virtues, Sacerdotium, Imperium, Studium, by whose harmonious cooperation the life and health of the Christian era are sustained."[3]

When older universities of Europe were founded they were dominated by Christian ideas and the Bible was their primary source of culture. "Even a hundred years ago the nation," adds Moberly, "was still, in intention, a God-fearing nation."[4] One fails to discover a similarity between the first definition of a university and the popular contemporary definition.

It is an established fact that there has been considerable change in the aim of education since colonial days. American colleges literally

---

[1]Murray H. Leiffer, Methodist Student Work at the Colleges of Arizona, California, and Nevada (Upland, Indiana: A. D. Freese and Sons, 1951), p. 10.

[2]George A. Buttrick, Faith and Education (New York: Abingdon-Cokesbury, 1952), p. 63.

[3]Moberly, op. cit., pp. 16-17, quoting Rashdall, The University of Europe in the Middle Ages. The quotation cited is from an unnamed medieval writer.

[4]Ibid., p. 101.

were born in the church. Initially they were founded for the primary purpose of providing a trained clergy and an intelligent and Christian laity among second generation Protestants.

Many of the original colonists who came to America from the old world migrated because they were descendants of an age of "Renaissance and Reformation." Their new beliefs in God and his relation to man needed to be perpetuated. They felt that they had to have education for their children or the tenets of their new-found faith would be lost.[1] Hence arose their awareness of a need for higher education which resulted in the founding of our first American colleges.

A review of the history of early American higher education reveals that in those days many of the functions of the church and the state appeared to be interdependent in operation, although they were separate in structure. For example, in some New England communities the right to vote was denied to those who were not acceptable members of the established church. This concept had a natural origin in the Calvinistic idea that people should be able to read and write the truths of the Bible, as well as the instruments of their political state. And if they were to know the Bible it was a logical assumption that they must be able to read. Hence there was a primary need for education for all.

Religion and education were thus joined for the first one hundred fifty years of American history. Colleges produced an abundance of "knee-praying" Bible-readers who were steeped in the Judeo-Christian heritage of their continental forebears.

The first radical shift in the religious policy of American higher education came with the founding of state universities at the time of the

---

[1]Arnold G. Tewksbury, The Founding of American Colleges and Universities (New York: Teachers College, Columbia University, 1932), pp. 55-59.

the validity of vocational education.[1]

The breakdown in liberal education which glorified technical courses in the college curriculum and de-emphasized the humanities--together with rapid and confusing changes in the structure of American social, economic, and political life--produced a brand of higher education whereby man sought to bring about his own salvation through the attainment of knowledge without widsom. This was a far cry from the sense of definite mission of the colonial college that was centered in religion and purposed specifically to prepare students spiritually for life.

With the upswing in secularism which accompanied the development of progressive education, it was natural that there should be the development of a tendency towards conformity which encouraged a popular attitude that there was no use to try to establish values or to try to have an encounter with God. This sttitude was accompanied by a tendency to try to measure God and value judgments in a test tube as the scientist measures physical elements, and it was accompanied by a third assumption--that just doing things and being busy about experience is true education.

With such a mood prevailing, it is no wonder that some college administrators of the day would have little or nothing to do with religion and ignored it as a valid area of intellectual inquiry. During this age there was an emergence of the philosophy which declared that man is fundamentally good and that he is able to determine his own destiny without discipline or guidance, and that truth is an unrelated mass of separate bits of learning.

---

[1]Harvard Report, General Education in a Free Society (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1945), p. 27. Cited hereafter as the Harvard Report.

Secularism, moral relativism, naturalism, and humanism mushroomed simultaneously on the college campus to confound a solid sense of values and to protest against a need of Christian faith. It was such a state of affairs which impelled Howard Lowry to soliloquize:

> Can education give to religion the peace it deserves? Can colleges and universities be open-minded enough to open their minds to the deepest questions raised by man and to thorough consideration of the classic answers given to these questions over the years? What have they done about this in the past? What are they doing now? Can they give religion a full expression in academic life and still keep the liberal character of true education and its intellectual integrity? How large can learning be?
>
> These . . . are all part, of course, of the question asked long ago and now become crucial in our time: "Where shall wisdom be found? And where is the place of understanding?"[1]

C. The Pendulum Swings Back

Nevertheless, in spite of the fact that the propagation of religion and the basic tenets of the Christian faith have not been deemed essential by many public school educators and college administrators, there are signs that during the past score of years the pendulum has been swinging back, and in many colleges there is a growing recognition for religious guidance and a deeper respect for religion.[2] Murray Leiffer says there is evidence that religion as a basic element in American culture, as a means of social control, and as a way of life, "is receiving more thoughtful attention at the hands of college presidents and deans . . . in the tax-supported institutions as well as in independent colleges, now

---

[1]Howard Lowry, The Mind's Adventure (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1951), p. 37.

[2]Thomas, op. cit., p. 7.

than at any time in the past two decades."[1] According to George F. Thomas of Princeton University, secularism has begun to lose its appeal and there has been a sharp reduction against the assumption that open-mindedness requires neutrality on ultimate issues.[2]

There appears to be a rising concern on the part of many educators and observers that religion on the college campus, as well as in all of life, can never be a peripheral matter. "It is a central and ultimate concern that constitutes the core of an individual's life and thought."[3]

With more and more frequency educators and administrators in higher education are arriving at the conclusion by logical deduction that education must be extended to meet the needs of the whole man. And if the needs of the whole man are to be fulfilled, it is a mistake arbitrarily to confine the objectives of liberal education to the intellectual sphere. They should embrace moral and spiritual goals as well. Within such a framework of reasoning it is argued that college experience, both in the classroom and on the campus, has consequences in both moral and spiritual areas, and that the college itself must shoulder some of the responsibility for these outcomes.

In support of this view we must consider the testimony of Dr. John M. Moore, who visited twenty-six colleges and universities of various types across the nation in 1952 under commission by the Edward W. Hazen Foundation to discover what place moral and religious values are playing in programs

---

[1]Leiffer, op. cit., p. 11.

[2]Thomas, op. cit., pp. 8-9.

[3]Bernard M. Loomer, "Religion and the Mind of the University," Liberal Learning and Religion, ed. Amos P. Wilder (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1951), p. 165.

of general education. After observing their programs and talking objectively with members of their faculty and student bodies, he reports that institutions of higher learning increasingly are making a larger place for religion in their general educational programs. He takes particular pains to witness that when influential officers and faculty members of a university or college believe in some form of religion and consider it important, they usually find a way to make a place for it in the educational program.[1]

With so many varied emphases and conflicting forces on the American campus vying with one another for control of students' loyalty, each citing valid grounds for discipleship, one wonders how guidance can be given to these students in their quest for direction? There appears to be a need for the discovery of some kind of a catalyst to bring clarification and a united answer to the claims of this army of beguilers which beseeches contemporary students.

There is recognized agreement among a number of responsible educators and observers concerning the need for some kind of an agency or integrating factor with which to cement together the multiplicity of areas of college study with their varied and often contradictory outlook into a unity which represents a common discipline and which gives meaning to all of life as well as to the entire life of the university community. That progressive education looked for such a unifying agency in the pragmatic method, which attempts to organize knowledge around experience and the facing of actual problems encountered by the later adolescent in his total

---

[1]John M. Moore, The Place of Moral and Religious Values in Programs of General Education (New Haven: The Hazen Foundation, 1952), pp. 3-6.

life situation, is no secret. But, as the Harvard Report in General Education in a Free Society discovered during an exhaustive inquiry into the present status of the American educational system, the solution is not to be found within the scope of pure pragmatism if such a method excludes belief and the meaning of the human spirit.[1]

The Harvard Report states that some Roman Catholic educators claim to have discovered such a unifying agency or integrating factor in Christianity because it gives such meaning and ultimate unity to the whole curriculum as well as to the college.[2] This claim was asserted by most American institutions of higher learning in early colonial days.

Religion could well be such an integrating factor or unifying agency to unite the various disciplines in the college curriculum, in the opinion of several observers of the collegiate scene. Dr. C. P. Shedd heartily concurred with this point of view a quarter of a century ago when he commented, "Religion must be at the heart of the educational process as a guiding, motivating, and integrating force."[3]

D. Signs of a Renaissance of Religion on Campus

There appears to be a rising resentment against the attempt of modern public educators to remain neutral whenever the area of religion is approached. The college administrators are coming to share the judgment of George A. Buttrick who writes, "When education remains silent concerning religion, by its very silence it is guilty of atheistic indoctrination";[4]

---

[1]Harvard Report, p. 27.

[2]Ibid., p. 39.

[3]Clarence P. Shedd, A Century of Christian Student Initiative (New York: Association Press, 1934), p. 49.

[4]Buttrick, op. cit., p. 23.

and of John M. Moore, who says, "The ultimate goal of liberal education is the harmonious development of all our powers."[1] Sharing this view is George F. Thomas, prominent educator of Princeton University, who states, "Religious facts, issues, and implications should be dealt with in every department and course where they arise naturally."[2] He adds, "Religion is not only relevant but indispensible to a full understanding of human nature and human life as a whole."[3] Even the National Education Association, which is convinced that intelligent and fervent loyalty to moral and spiritual values on the part of students of the public schools is becoming increasingly essential to the survival of the nation, makes these significant admissions:

> To omit from the classroom all references to religion and the institutions of religion is to neglect an important part of American life. Knowledge about religion is essential for a full understanding of our cultures.[4]
>
> A great and continuing purpose of education (in America) has been the development of moral and spiritual values.[5]
>
> The development of moral and spiritual values is basic to all other educational objectives. Education uninspired by moral and spiritual values is directionless.[6]
>
> Education in moral and spiritual values can furnish a yardstick against which any future problem may be measured.[7]

---

[1]Moore, op. cit., p. 21.

[2]Thomas, op. cit., p. 13.

[3]Ibid., p. 29.

[4]National Education Association, Moral and Spiritual Values in the Public Schools, A Report prepared by the Educational Policies Commission of the N.E.A. (Washington: National Educational Association, 1951), pp. 77-78.

[5]Ibid., p. 3.

[6]Ibid., pp. 6-7.

[7]Ibid., p. 7.

The secular press "climbs on the band wagon," figuratively speaking, to spread this new gospel through the medium of The Saturday Evening Post when a mature college chaplain makes the following profound observation, "State universities, as well as private colleges are increasingly aware that a total knowledge of religion is a necessary part of a balanced education."[1]

There are a number of indications of the fresh interest in religion on the college campus which support the theory that intellectual life and religious faith are inseparable parts of the larger spiritual life of man and that their deliberate separation in the college community is artificial and detrimental to the education of the whole man.

One indication is the substantial library of books and literature dealing with the history and problems of religion in higher education which has been produced during the past quarter-century. Before the 1930's there was a dearth of basic literary materials in this area, but through the encouragement of foundations (such as Hazen, Danforth, Alden, Rockefeller, Ford and others) as well as through the contribution of seminary graduates and college chaplains, a respectable shelf of essential books, brochures, and essays on religion in higher education has become available.[2] New books involving religious perspectives in the teaching of the various college disciplines have enlightened faculty and administration, as well as added to the knowledge of local near-campus pastors of university churches who are eager to discover new ways to add their respective

---

[1]Jones B. Shannon, "Religious Revolution on the Campus," The Saturday Evening Post (March 29, 1958), p. 62.

[2]C. P. Shedd, "Religion in Higher Education Retrospect and Prospect," The Christian Scholar, XXXVIII, No. 4 (December 1955), p. 5.

contributions to the creation of an "ideal college community." The mere fact that these books enjoy a wide and increasing circulation indicates that those who are concerned with higher education are seeking valid answers to a difficult question and that they are more willing than ever to assume responsibility for seeking and finding solutions to the many problems of religion in the college community.[1]

Another indication is the steadily rising support of departments and schools of religion by colleges of all types. This is accompanied by an acknowledged improvement in the quality of teaching and the standards of training of faculty people who teach religion on the college level, as well as by an increasing number of opportunities afforded to teachers in other fields who are willing to approach their respective disciplines with religious perspective.[2] When teachers discover how they can teach with regard to the religious perspectives of their respective departments often they are willing to do so. The objectives of such organizations as the Danforth Foundation have fostered such willingness to a marked degree. At this point mention must be made of the valuable contributions being made by the Faculty Christian Fellowship (to which later reference will be made) which was founded for the benefit of Christian teachers on the college campus as "a community of people in the academic life whose concern is the relation of Christian faith to the vocations and disciplines of the teacher and the scholar."[3]

---

[1] Edward W. Hazen Foundation, Report of the Edward W. Hazen Foundation for the years 1925-1950 (New Haven: Edward W. Hazen Foundation, 1950), p. 37. Cited hereafter as the Hazen Report.

[2] Ibid.

[3] The Faculty Christian Fellowship, a pamphlet issued by The Faculty Christian Fellowship, 257 Fourth Avenue, New York 10, N. Y.

As some college administrators scan sources for the enlistment of new personnel with which to staff departments against rising enrollments, they are discovering the wisdom of adding to their faculties a proportionate number of accredited scholars who are themselves committed to a religious way of life. If these new teachers are well qualified in scholarship they add flavor and balance to the teaching staff. Dr. C. P. Shedd says of the new concern in colleges about teaching and the Christian witness of the teachers as they labor in the classroom:

> The best way to guarantee a religiously significant educational experience is by increasing the number of faculty members who, to the scholarly distinction and skill as teachers add the quality of a reasoned and contagious religious faith. This concern is certainly more alive today than in the twenties, when, in too many colleges, it was not considered intellectually respectable for the teacher to deal with the religious meanings of his field.[1]

A marked increase in the number of chapel buildings and worship centers being erected on the campuses of schools of all types, as well as a noticeable tendency to employ more chaplains, college pastors, co-ordinators of religion, and directors of campus religious life are other trends which indicate the rising interest of higher education in religion.

Other positive trends fostering a more objective view of religion on the campus are (1) the rapid growth of the interfaith movement (Protestant, Catholic, Jew) which allegedly promotes "justice, amity, understanding, and cooperation"[2] among the three religious communities on the college campus; (2) a developing interest in the role of Americans in cross-cultural relations (including increased interest in the meaning and

---

[1] Shedd, op. cit., p. 9.

[2] Will Herberg, Protestant-Catholic-Jew (New York: Doubleday and Company, 1955), p. 258.

significance of foreign students and international exchanges of students); and (3) a new look at legal limitations of religion at tax-supported schools and the resultant awakening of recognition that America's original principle of separation of church and state was never intended to limit or to destroy religion, but rather to support and strengthen it.[1] Further comment on the latter will be reserved for mention in a later chapter.

The Hazen Report calls attention to still another shifting trend of higher education in its effort to understand and re-think the meaning of liberal education. This change in the current of educational thought, which began a decade ago, is a more concerted effort on the part of administrators and faculty to re-think education with the student as the primary focus of attention.[2]

The focal point in higher education ought to be the student, rather than the subject matter. This appeared to be the crux of the revolt of progressive education against the traditional method of classical learning. Despite criticism heaped upon John Dewey for his break with conventional learning habits, the shift of emphasis from subject matter to pupil, from structured lectures by which knowledge was literally poured into the notebook of the receiver without regard for his creative thought to helping the pupil discover how to find truth by thinking for himself, i.e., learning by doing, marks a notable advance in the evolution of modern education. Only in such an atmosphere of free enquiry where students are given helpful guidance but allowed to do a required amount of

---

[1] Clarence P. Shedd, Religion in the State Universities, a pamphlet printed by the Edward W. Hazen Foundation, 400 Prospect Street, New Haven, Conn., p. 12.

[2] The Hazen Report, p. 32.

brain-searching for themselves can they learn intellectual honesty and independence of mind--standards by which they must learn to meet life.

The Hazen Report supports the tendency toward this trend by citing the rising interest in concern for student counseling at college. An entirely new "science" of testing and measuring and related services which are slanted at the student discovering himself, his aptitudes, and his capabilities has been evolved and multiplied through the personnel departments of most schools of higher education. Student personnel work has become a highly specialized profession which is recognized as a valid segment in the college curriculum.[1]

In their attempt to spotlight the needs of students as persons college administrators are also cognizant of their obligation to improve friendly personal contact between faculty and students. Some universities are providing special ways outside of casual classroom association to cultivate personal relations between teachers and students because they regard it as essential to a liberal education.[2]

This new emphasis on the student at college has subtle religious implications. It provokes the asking of such questions as: Who is the student? Where is he going? What are his problems? What are his needs as a person and as a citizen? What about his sense of values and judgments? What are his ethical and religious leaning and decisions? How does he face up to vocation, family life, future citizenship? When one has discovered the answers to these questions he will be able better to understand how to approach the religious needs of the student and

---

[1] Ibid., p. 33.

[2] Ibid., p. 34.

and minister to him on the spiritual plane. And this, precisely, will be the point of inquiry of the next chapter.

B. Summary

In summary, this chapter has called attention to a crisis which has been provoked in higher education because of a widening gap separating the intellectual from spiritual emphases. It was shown how this state reflects a similar dilemma facing the whole of civilization; and because the universities are no longer discharging their former central task, the entire social order appears to be in trouble.

We have reviewed the manner in which religion and education, once inseparably connected in medieval and colonial times, have drifted apart on the campuses of American schools because of a shifting of social and political doctrines and the advance of sectarianism, industrialism, scientism and secularism, which, in turn, resulted in a confounding of values and a protest against the need for Christian faith.

But we have also seen how during the past twenty years the pendulum has been swinging back and the subject of religion is finding a more receptive ear in college communities. The indifference to religion which characterized the college campus two decades ago has been evaporating, and in its place there is rising interest in religion.

The writer has related how there is a growing conviction among administration and faculty that the campus can no longer remain silent about or neutral to moral and spiritual spheres, and that the college must share responsibility with the student for his enlightenment in these areas.

In a search for an integrating factor to unify the various and sundry disciplines of the college curriculum it was established that

religion might well become such an integrating factor. Indications that religious faith and intellectual life on the campus are becoming more compatible were offered by the following marks of a renaissance of religion on the campus: (1) the creation of a new library of books and literature in religion and higher education; (2) a willingness on the part of more teachers to consider the religious dimensions of their various disciplines as they labor in the classroom; (3) increasing support of departments and schools of religion in all types of schools; (4) the addition to college faculties of a proportionate number of new qualified teachers who are themselves grounded in a personal religious faith; (5) marked increase in the erection of chapel buildings and the employment of chaplains and directors of campus religious life; (6) the growth of the inter-faith movement; (7) a more liberal look at legal restrictions limiting the support of religion at public-supported institutions of higher learning; (8) and, in general, a growing tendency on the part of university administrators to concede that there is a valid place for the consideration of religion in the total scheme of higher education.

Thus we have observed that while higher education has faced a dilemma, religion has been discovered as a key which can unlock many mysteries of this dilemma. Now that the door of free inquiry is swinging open again on the campus and administrators are looking with a more friendly eye upon a return of religion to the heart of the university as an integrating agent which makes both education and life meaningful, it will be observed how much better opportunity the student has to investigate the claims of religion as a valid area for questioning, and, in turn, to be served by extra-curricular agencies which have been designed to aid him in

his search for spiritual truth. And it will also be observed how much better opportunity the university parish pastor has to serve the religious needs of students. Now that there appears to be a growing regard for the respectability of religion on the campus again, the role of the local parish pastor increases in significance as well as in challenge.

Having considered the place of religion as it relates to contemporary general education in the foregoing chapter, in the next chapter the writer will endeavor to get a glimpse into the mind of today's college student as it relates to the area of religion in higher education.

CHAPTER III

WHO IS THE CONTEMPORARY COLLEGE STUDENT?

Basic to this study is a clear picture of the shifting educational background and setting of the modern college student. If the university parish pastor is to learn how to serve the needs of the student better he must begin where the student is and find answers to the following questions: Who is the contemporary college student? Where does he come from and why does he go to college? What are his fundamental attitudes? What are his major concerns? How alike or how different is he from the college student of former generations? What changes, if any, have taken place in his characteristics? What about his sense of values--has it shifted since his father was a student? Is he as "religious" as he used to be? It is important that such questions as these be explored before a firm foundation for this study can be established.

If a university parish pastor who is charged with the responsibility of serving students would increase his proficiency in fulfilling his obligation to student life, it would also seem imperative that he find out all he can about the young people who come to college. He should discover their motives, their problems, their relationships, their ambitions for success and vocation, and then compare and contrast the similarities and differences of these concepts with the objectives of higher education and the central thrust of the universe. In this chapter, therefore, the writer will endeavor to take a realistic look at

the students who flock to our institutions of higher learning in increasing numbers, in light of their relation to religion in higher education.

A review of contemporary writing in the general area of higher education indicates that there has been considerable change in the nature of modern college students as contrasted to that of their predecessors. As a matter of fact, there has been a plethora of literary verbiage poured out about this controversial subject, and even more is being said than is being written about this alleged change in the total outlook and perspective of modern college youth. Max Wise, in reporting to the American Council of Education on a survey of students attending American colleges and universities, concludes that significant changes have taken place. His comment quoted as follows in the timely booklet They Come for the Best of Reasons could be of immeasurable benefit to those who are concerned with modern higher education on this continent:

> The enormously increased complexity of our Society, with its needs for higher levels of training in technological and professional skills and its demands for broadened educational opportunities for all has had its effect . . . in the growth of a widely diversified . . . student population. College students today range from young to old, able to mediocre, idealistic to practical, naive to sophisticated, rich to poor; they are of all races, of all faiths--and of no faith. They are both full time students and part time students; they are both self-supporting and still dependent on their families. All these go to college, each for his own purpose.[1]

Reporting to the Commission on the College Student of the American Council on Education, Wise summarizes the important recent shifts which he feels have been made in the characteristics of the American college student during the last ten years as follows: (1) the average age of undergraduates has increased; (2) more of them are

---

[1] W. Max Wise, They Come for the Best of Reasons (Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1958), pp. 1-2.

married; (3) more of them are working to go to college and they have more money to spend; (4) their interest has shifted towards business and the social sciences and they are considerably more involved in specialized and graduate study; (5) they are not as aggressive as their fathers, but more interested in security; (6) they are more self-centered and no longer "fired up" to "save" the world; and (7) as a group they are considerably different from their predecessors.[1]

Conflicting and confusing labels have been pasted on the present generation of students by those who observe the shifting campus scene. They run the gamut between widely separated extremes. On the one hand there is a number of observers who declare that today's college students are an irresponsible and lost generation. And on the other hand there is ample evidence which leads a growing body of observers to declare that even though college students may appear to be less responsible and more irreligious than were students of former generations, they reflect a more serious attitude towards life and a deeper determination to discover its meaning. It will be valuable to take a look at what advocates of these two opposed views propound and see whether between the findings of both we can discover a true picture of present day student life.

A. One View of the Student--A Picture of Despair

An apathetic picture of despair is painted on one side of the coin by those who declare that the contemporary college student belongs to a hopeless generation of self-centered sophisticates. Merrimon Cuninggim says they are a band of "happy pagans who are blissfully

---

[1] Ibid., pp. 22-32.

ignorant . . ."[1] Robert Hutchins confesses that the compelling motive for enrolling in college today is for hope of material benefits. He violently decries a rising tendency to pursue higher education solely for vocational and financial reward, insisting that the mind of modern college students is crammed with facts which they never learn to relate.[2]

One of the most caustic criticisms of present day college youth is offered in the comprehensive and exhaustive findings of a series of college-life surveys synthesized by Philip E. Jacob, professor of Political Science at the University of Pennsylvania, and a competent committee of educators and consultants. This book, which is titled Changing Values in College,[3] is a carefully documented and sobering attempt to discover whether general education in the social sciences brings about perceptive changes in students' beliefs and values. The study is an outgrowth of a related survey by Professor John Moore of Swarthmore College and a group of competent collaborators. It concerns the place of religious and moral values in programs of general education at twenty-six colleges and universities. The survey, which was conducted by a number of eminent sociologists, philosophers, historians, and professors of psychology and religion under the auspices of the Edward W. Hazen Foundation, presents a profile to today's college student which is characteristic of the portrait on the first side of the coin.

---

[1]Merrimon Cuninggim, The College Seeks Religion (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1947), p. 7.

[2]Robert M. Hutchins, The Conflict in Education (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1953), pp. 12-18.

[3]Philip E. Jacob, Changing Values in College (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1957). Cited hereafter as the Jacob Study.

In summarizing his synthesis, Dr. Jacob finds that modern college students are a "gloriously contented generation" as they view their prospects for the future.[1] He declares, in light of exhaustive research, that college life does not appear to change or alter the mold of values held by most students who are described as self-centered, looking first for what they can get out of life, and expecting others to do likewise. He states that the average college students emerge from school upon graduation as a kind of a cultural "rubber stamp" for the social heritage as it stands rather than the instigator of new patterns of thought and new standards of conduct. While they may indicate that they respect sincerity, honesty and loyalty as proper standards, their obeisance to these standards is rendered in lip service because they do not choose to be critical of their peers when they stray from such standards. They have low principles in regard to academic honesty and are prone to look askance when systematic cheating is commonly practiced, observes Jacob.[2] Moral values do not enjoy top priority in student thinking.

Dr. Jacob also finds that students appear to express a normal need for religion but have a "ghostly quality" about their religious beliefs which belies their practical application. "Their religion does not carry over to guide and govern important decisions in the secular world," says Jacob. In the mind of the student, "God has little to do with the behavior of men in society," and the place of Supreme Diety is in the church and perhaps in the home, but certainly not in the realm of business or in the community. "God is worshipped by the student," says

---

[1] Ibid., p. 1.

[2] Ibid., p. 2.

Jacob, "dutifully and with propriety, but the campus is not permeated by a live sense of His presence."[1]

Jacob also found that while American students are dutifully responsive towards government, they are willing enough to render tribute to Caesar but such service is performed without enthusiasm. He found them predicting another major war within a half-decade, yet generally disinterested and lacking knowledge of and confidence in the United Nations as an "instrument of cooperative international action."[2] He discovered that a minority of twenty to twenty-five per cent appeared to value their college education for its promise of intellectual rewards or its "nurturing of personal character and the capacity for responsible human relationships."[3] A majority appear to be at college chiefly to prepare themselves for a vocation which will return them a profitable living and afford them pleasant experience in the social amenities.

Although the Jacob Study presents a negative and humbling picture, it cannot be ignored. It points the direction towards a long overdue re-examination of the entire academic program of higher education. It demands that all those who are responsible for college curriculum re-examine their task. The report presents a sobering challenge to church-related colleges (which it claims are among the worst offenders) that they take a closer look at their avowed purposes and intentions. It lets loose a flood of argument in favor of reorienting disciplines of the college curriculum in the light of their religious implications.

---

[1] Ibid., p. 3.

[2] Ibid.

[3] Ibid.

In contemplating the face on the first side of the coin it will be profitable to observe the findings of a second more recently published interpretation of an important survey which presents a similar view to the one shared by Jacob. This is a volume titled What College Students Think, published in 1960 under the authorship of four sociologists on the faculty of Cornell university.[1] Like the Jacob Study, this book drew much of its primary material from data produced by the Cornell Values Study and reports some of the more general findings of that research program. Because of its multiple authorship it will be called the Cornell Study henceforth in this presentation.

Although there appears to be correlation between the findings of Dr. Jacob and the reports of the four Cornell professors, and in general the thrust of both volumes extends in the same direction, data for the Cornell Study were handled differently and the problem was analyzed from a varied point of view. This study, which attempts to discover what the college student is actually thinking about college, presents opinions of students showing their own evaluation of such important areas in the life of the student as college education, career, college life, attitudes on politics, economy, national and international opinions, religious beliefs, and ideas about religion. In helping their readers to analyze what college students are thinking today, the authors of this study help us to gain added insight as we look for an answer to our question, "Who is the contemporary college student?"

---

[1] Rose K. Goldsen, Morris Rosenberg, Robin M. Williams, Jr., Edward A. Suchman, What College Students Think (New York: D. Van Nostrand Company, Inc., 1960). Cited hereafter as the Cornell Study.

In the Cornell Study it is found, in general, that college students are aware of a need for some kind of religious faith or personal philosophy to give meaning to their lives. "They talk about it, grope for it, and some of them eagerly seize upon this or that organizational means of finding it."[1] But even though sixty per cent of the students surveyed feel that they have an adequate faith or personal philosophy as a guide to conduct,[2] the study finds that there is a certain absence of identification of the student with religion and even a more marked absence of intense commitment to it. "We find no support for the contention that the campuses are seeing a revival of religion . . . In religion, as in politics, the students 'play it cool,'" according to the Cornell professors.[3] They add:

> The content of their beliefs is decidedly away from orthodoxy; as we analyze their testimony, it would appear that individualistic and relativistic approaches are characteristic. Most students are agreed on the importance of religious values that appear to represent some least common denominator of personal religious and ethical belief. Yet when we trace some of the links between religious beliefs and social attitudes, we find certain patterns of thought which suggest that religious belief, for many students, seems to be engaged in the service of their psychological quest for certainty--a quest which is also linked to rigidities and intolerances in secular matters.[4]

When questioned as to how they felt about religion the Cornell researchers found the thinking of most college students falling into a pattern of paradoxes. For example, at least seventy-five per cent of

---

[1]Cornell Study, p. 153.

[2]Ibid., p. 154.

[3]Ibid., p. xxiii.

[4]Ibid.

them say that they believe in God or a supreme force ruling the universe, but religious commitment is rare.[1] Religious belief on the campus is widespread, but at the same time the philosophic climate of the campus is non-religious.[2] College youth may appear to be "religious," but there is little relation with this profession of belief and matters of moral and ethical choice like cheating, drinking, pre-marital sex relations, etc.[3] Although most students profess to be believers, they are more likely than not to express feelings of racial and religious intolerance[4] and more likely than not to revert to the status quo when under pressure to conform. They are unanimous in agreement that religious freedom is essential in a democracy, yet fifty-nine per cent of them are unwilling to grant their professors unlimited academic freedom in the class room.[5] The study finds the present generation of students, "politically disinterested, apathetic and conservative. Special movements do not arouse their interest or command their commitment."[6]

It is not difficult to find substantial evidence to document the negative picture which Jacob paints and the paradoxical profile which the Cornell Study would etch on the one side of the coin. In justice to the members of the distinguished committees who labored in both areas of this

---

[1] Ibid., p. 16.

[2] Ibid., p. 202.

[3] Ibid., p. 177.

[4] Ibid., p. 181.

[5] Ibid., p. 185.

[6] Ibid., p. 199.

larger survey of student life to present facts as they found them it should be acknowledged that much of the criticism offered by these reports is probably justified. However, in justice to all concerned it is only right that attention be called to another point of view taken by a growing body of observers who protest against the portrait painted on the first side of the coin.

There is growing evidence to support the claim that today's college students may be different from what their elders were. But are they very different? They are not ignorant, and certainly they are not stupid. The present generation of students might not be so sure where they are going as were students of former generations, but one is impelled to ask at this juncture, "Who isn't less sure of where he is going these days?" Who among the older is really sure about how to deal creatively with such disturbing issues as desegregation, intercontinental ballistic missiles, the issues of the Middle East and the terrible alternative which a nuclear-space age thrusts upon us in "a race between civilization and incineration?"[1]

B. Another View of the Student--A Picture of Hope

A happier and more hopeful picture of contemporary college life is revealed on the other side of the coin. In fairness to this total study we must turn it over and look at the face pictured there. There is ample evidence documented by a host of responsible observers of the

---

[1]Clarence P. Shedd, "Moral and Spiritual Values in Public Higher Education," Moral and Spiritual Values in California Junior Colleges, Proceedings of the Davis Conference held at the University of California at Davis, California, January 31-February 2, 1958, Published by the Edward W. Hazen Foundation, p. 23.

college scene which refutes the pessimistic overtones of the Jacob and Cornell Studies. This evidence challenges the contention that campus life shows major causes for despair. Let us look at this second picture.

A clue to the discovery of the more optimistic picture portrayed on the other side of the collegiate coin is perceived between the lines of the Jacob and Cornell Studies themselves. For example, Jacob states that the profile which he paints represents the value-judgments of only seventy-five to eighty per cent of all college students surveyed.[1] What about the other twenty to twenty-five per cent? This represents too large a minority to be ignored. The fact that this high percentage does not fit into Jacob's findings is a hopeful sign.

Jacob also readily admits the possibility of error in his judgments and invites challenge of his major conclusions, agreeing that they are open to debate on the grounds that the measurement of human attitudes, feelings and opinions can be an illusive process for the production of firm and preditable data. He furthermore acknowledges that many of the instruments used in this study to detect and weigh values lacked sufficient sensitivity.[2]

Contradictions are discovered within the summary of the Cornell Study which must be mentioned. The fact that this study finds many paradoxes in the way students think about God, life, the campus, society, and the universe logically admits to the possibility of redemptive qualities within the nature of the student. For example, the Cornell

---

[1] Jacob Study, p. 3.

[2] Ibid., p. 131.

professors admit that religious belief for many students seems to be engaged "in the service of their psychological quest for certainty."[1] Questing for such certainty is, in essence, a search after meaning in life. And when one searches for meaning in life he is searching after ultimate truth which is God!

The findings of the Cornell Study are also decidedly limited on the basis of only a six per cent sampling,[2] which provides hardly a large enough specimen of data for representative testing. Nor does the Cornell Study claim to represent a national sample. It deliberately selected eleven of the larger and well established universities (which are not representative of the average college students found on all of the American campuses) because they were "the most influential types of universities in this country, and not the most representative."[3]

For the purpose of our observation the chief flaw in the Cornell plan appears to be that with the exception of one college this study sampled only the men.[4] For measuring what college students think about a number of areas of university experience the consensus of only male students might produce valid data. But when women are excluded from questioning about religious beliefs, attitudes, and practices, it is reasonable to conclude that the resultant data will be distorted. The authors of the Cornell Study furthermore admit that their findings can't be guaranteed as absolute; that they are based on figures that give only

---

[1] Ibid., p. xxiii.

[2] Ibid., p. xxvi.

[3] Ibid.

[4] Ibid.

relative measurements; and that conclusions are formulated on the testimony of only the students who represent extremes of variation (i.e., only those who are "more so" and those who are "less so"). The authors are in complete agreement that, "the human creature remains complex, whimsical, and often . . . defiant of classification."[1]

We turn now to examine a larger body of authoritative evidence which brings this brighter picture on the other side of the coin into more optimistic focus. Max Wise is representative of observers in this group. He contributes creatively to background information for this study as he speaks to the question, "Who is the college student today?" He says that students may go to college for different reasons than did their parents, but they are good reasons. They are "the best of reasons."[2] Wise warns against the quick acceptance of a stereotyped impression of college life when he says:

> Our natural urge to classify and type college students--for example, "the silent generation," "the no-nonsense kids," "the careful young men," "the generation without heroes," "the intellectually godless," "our egocentric college youth," "the gloriously contented"--leads us to overlook the complexity that actually exists. Having reduced this diversity of material to understandable dimensions and then labeled our classifications, we tend to assume that the label represents the original complex reality. It is essential that we not lose sight of this underlying reality--that we keep constantly in mind, as nearly as our human limitations permit, the total range of differences represented by our college students.[3]

Refuting the inference that the "Joe College" of present campus life is an insecure personality who wants merely to be safe, the

---

[1] Ibid., p. xxviii.

[2] Wise, op. cit., p. 4.

[3] Ibid., p. 3.

Rockefeller Report on Education pleads that we look at college students in perspective, that we see them "as participants in one of the most exciting eras in history and . . . [having] a sense of purpose in relation to it."[1] College students are described in the report as follows:

> It is essential that we enable them to see that they are living out in their own lives--in their own convictions and fears and tensions--one of the gravest crises that has ever occurred in man's relationships to man. And they must see, too, that it is a time of great opportunity for man--if he has the wisdom and the courage to profit by it.[2]

"We want meaning in our lives!" is the cry of young people today, according to the Rockefeller Report.[3]

The authors of the report were sharply critical of serious defects in American education and frankly declared that the future of this nation depends largely upon whether these defects can be remedied. The report circulated widely, was excerpted in several leading newspapers and magazines and provided serious study for a number of educational societies.[4]

In more complete context the report states:

> what most people, young or old, want is not merely security or comfort or luxury--although they are glad enough to have these. They want meaning in their lives. If their era and their culture and their leaders do not or cannot offer them great meanings, great objectives, great convictions, then they will settle for shallow and trivial meanings. . . . People who live aimlessly, who are

---

[1] Rockefeller Brothers Fund, The Pursuit of Excellence: Education and the Future of America, Special Studies Project Report V, America at Mid-Century Series (Garden City, New York: Doubleday and Company, Inc., 1958), p. 46. Cited hereafter as the Rockefeller Report.

[2] Ibid.

[3] Ibid., p. 48.

[4] Samuel P. Meyer, "We State a Need," excerpt from a paper read before the California-Nevada Methodist Conference Pastor's School at Mt. Hermon, California, April 7, 1959.

> satisfied by shoddy experiences, have simply not been stirred by any alternative meanings--religious meanings, ethical values, ideals of social and civic responsibility, high standards of self-realization.
>
> This is a deficiency for which we all bear a responsibility. It is . . . a failure of all of us.[1]

The co-authors of the Cornell Study arrive at the same judgment about the needs of today's college students and the basic criteria for measuring the success of their higher education when they conclude:

> Man today has conquered the atom and invaded space. Yet the basic problem of the human condition remains unchanged; how to live with uncertainty and make one's peace with it; how to invest the days of one's life with meaning.[2]

Another clue to the true nature of youth who inhabit campuses of American institutions of higher learning as they face the 1960's is supplied by Loren B. Pope, education editor of the New York Times, who after a survey of college life on 1,800 campuses across the nation, comes to the conclusion that upperclassmen are most interested in the personal questions, "Who am I?" and "Where am I going?"[3]

If it is true that the present generation of college students is seeking for security, perhaps these questions indicate the kind of security they are seeking. Essentially these basic questions on the part of youth reveal a deep hunger for purposeful relationship with the universe. They point toward a secret quest for a sense of being.

Wise says that this generation is looking for answers, but because of the nature of the times students today are less sure of finding

---

[1]Rockefeller Report, p. 48.

[2]Cornell Study, p. 203.

[3]Loren B. Pope, "Education in Review," The New York Times, June 7, 1959, section E, p. 11.

answers than were their fathers.[1] Wise also qualifies the criticism that modern college youth are not "on fire" to save the world in a single generation (as were youth in yesteryear who "joined" such Student Christian organizations as the Student Volunteer Movement) by suggesting that youth are no longer sure of what the world should become.[2]

Unwilling to "sell today's college youth short," Dr. C. P. Shedd (who probably has been in a position to view student life in colleges across the nation for a quarter of a century more objectively than any other single observer) calls them "a wistful generation, tired of living on snap judgments and seeking enduring foundations."[3] He adds:

> It is the most intelligently responsible generation that I have known . . . seeking to come to grips with the basic problems of faith and living . . . asking not superficial but ultimate questions, and they will not be satisfied with easy answers. They want to find solid ground for ultimate answers.[4]

Jones B. Shannon, college chaplain at Pennsylvania State University, says that most observers of college trends are in agreement that there is much more solid faith evident among students and professors than existed a generation ago. "These are students who are seeking answers, not just peace of mind.[5]

---

[1]Wise, op. cit., p. 28.

[2]Ibid.

[3]Clarence P. Shedd, "Religion in Higher Education, Retrospect and Prospect," The Christian Scholar, XXXVIII, No. 4 (December, 1955), 7.

[4]Ibid., pp. 7-8.

[5]Jones B. Shannon, "Religious Revolution on the Campus," The Saturday Evening Post, March 29, 1958, pp. 20-64.

Dr. Alexander Miller, late head of the department of Religion at Stanford University, maintained that there is a definite upswing of interest in religion on the campuses of private liberal arts schools. He attributed this "revival" on the campus to four causes: (1) parents are clamoring for more "religion" for their college youth to stabilize them in an unstable world (parents are anxious lest their children be as poorly equipped to meet the problems of life as they are); (2) business demands more "religion" as a tool with which to fight Communism; (3) the community demands it (life is falling apart and there is a general realization on the part of people that there is a need for religious bolstering); and (4) there is considerable pressure on the part of students themselves who feel inadequate without training in religion to meet the problems of life.[1]

From his vantage point as member of the Quadrennial Commission on Christian Higher Education for the Methodist Church, Bishop Donald H. Tippett said, "There has been a change in the student community from opposition to religion through apathetic toleration to earnest seeking."[2]

Describing the picture on the other side of the coin, college chaplain Shannon flatly challenges the charges that the American campus is completely dominated by secularism. He insists that instead a revival of religion has taken place. Shannon states that many students " . . . are looking more and more to their churches for deeper meaning and understanding of life and its ultimate meanings."[3]

---

[1] Alexander Miller, "The Teaching of Religion at Stanford University," lecture before class in Religion and Higher Education at the Pacific School of Religion, Berkeley, California, May 4, 1958.

[2] Donald H. Tippett, Excerpt from the Council of Administrator's Address to the California-Nevada Conference of the Methodist Church, mimeographed for distribution May, 1957.

[3] Shannon, op. cit., p. 1.

In his book titled The Mind's Adventure, Howard Lowry supports the testimony of the latter group as he affirms the creative restlessness of the student mind which he says is fed up with the status quo and demanding a broader view of life than has been dealt him, including a deep desire to come to some kind of conviction.[1] The modern college student is sick of futile meaninglessness in secularized college inquiry and seeks a more enduring philosophy for the foundation of life. He is looking for intelligent answers to hard questions--not just for peace of mind. He desires more point to life than making money and spending hours. He is questing for a more adequate understanding of religion and a more complete and a satisfying relation to the universe in terms of his own religious experience.

One of the marks which indicates that today's college student is ready, willing, and eager to deal with basic questions of ultimate truth and yearns for a faith which is adequate to deal with the tensions and crises of the times is a readily observed revival of interest and greatly enlarged participation in local and intercollegiate activities of volunteer student Christian organizations. Further comment on this matter will be reserved for the next chapter where it will be included as background material for a description of the Student Christian Movement and the advent of an organized ministry to Methodist students on the contemporary college campus.

A final illustration with which the writer may provide a clue as to the true nature of the college student who shows signs of emerging

---

[1]Lowry, op. cit., p. 69.

on the contemporary campus is a statement by Dr. William Kirkland, late Alumni Professor of Christian Ethics at McCormick Theological Seminary. He says:

> . . . in the dignity, the restraint, and compassion of many college students, Negro and white, who participate in "sit-in" demonstrations, we see new expressions of Christian commitment and witness in our own time. Here is rebellion that is not irrelevant, protest that is not pointless, nonconformity that is born of compassion, involvement that springs from integrity. Perhaps we are witnessing a break-through in the spiritual impasse that heretofore has seemed to immobilize the present younger generation.[1]

C. Summary

Which side of the coin presents the true picture of the contemporary college student and answers the question, "Who is he?" Is he the gloriously contented, self-centered, "happy pagan" as suggested by the findings of the Jacob and Cornell Studies? Or is he the more serious-minded seeker after meaning in life as represented by a host of equally authoritative observers of the modern campus scene?

To this question there can be no glib answer, and he who seeks to minister to the needs of college students will address himself continually in quest of a right answer. Perhaps he will conclude that a true picture of "Joe College" is engraved on one side of the coin or upon the other; or perhaps he will conclude that a more proper picture is provided by a combination of both, and that the dual nature of today's college student requires a double exposure.

In summary of this chapter which has been devoted to the contemporary college student, opportunity has been offered to review a

---

[1]William Kirkland, "The Gospel and the Off-beat Generation," International Journal of Religious Education, XXXVII, No. 5, (January, 1961), 6.

debate which has been going on about the true nature of the student. As contrasted to a consensus of the Jacob Study and, to a degree, the Cornell Study, that today's students are self-centered, grasping, and without sense of value-judgment, we have heard the testimony of a growing body of qualified observers who claim that students may go to college for different reasons than their parents went, but "they are the best of reasons."

Research reveals that in spite of the paradoxical, dual nature of students, a responsible minority of them are asking searching questions and demanding reasonable answers. They are imploring, "Who am I?" and "Where am I going?" These are questions with religious implications. Confirmation that many modern college students are ready to deal with basic issues of ultimate truth is also offered by evidences of a revival of activities of volunteer religious student organizations at all types of schools, and by the favorable reaction of administrators and off-campus agencies as they strive increasingly to augment the contributions of the volunteer student movements to the university community.

Having outlined the place of religion as it relates to general education on the college campus, and having presented some provocative answers to the question "Who is the contemporary college student?", in the next chapter the writer will describe what has been done by The Methodist Church to follow its students to college campuses across the nation. This will provide further background and setting for the ministry of the near-campus Methodist pastor as he relates to student life in the university community.

CHAPTER IV

THE METHODIST CHURCH FOLLOWS ITS STUDENTS

In this chapter the writer will attempt to furnish additional groundwork upon which the thesis will stand. Against a proper setting in religion in higher education the writer will continue a preliminary consideration of involved factors which he felt was needed to be related in order that the study at hand might be approached with adequate perspective.

The chapter will outline what The Methodist Church has done (and what it is doing) in an organized fashion to establish a complete ministry to students of its faith who enroll at all types of colleges today. It will begin with an outline of the history of Methodist higher education in America from its inception on British soil, cite its relationship to and dependence upon the rise of the Christian Student Movement, include an account of the rise of the denominational Foundations and the Methodist Student Movement, and indicate recent actions of the General Conference in the area of Christian higher education. Then, having set the stage for the study at hand, the university parish pastor who ministers to students at near-campus Methodist churches will be introduced as the character who plays the leading role in this dissertation. How he fits into the total program of religious guidance offered to Methodist students at colleges across the nation will be explained.

A. The History of Methodist Higher Education

It is significant that The Holy Club, whence Methodism took its name, came into being at the heart of a university. Under the leadership of John Wesley, Charles Wesley, and George Whitefield, the initial evangelistic passion that warmed the hearts of the first Methodists was wedded to an equally genuine passion for higher education. For one and three-quarters of a century these two elements, The Holy Club and the university, have blended to symbolize the importance of a well educated clergy as united with an informed laity. It is as though the leaders of the church have continuously said of the union of these two elements, "What God hath joined together let not man put asunder."[1]

As long as Wesley lived, and up until the time of the foundation of the Methodist Church in America, Methodists were interested in college life. Although founders in England depended heavily upon lay leadership for supervision of local societies, preachers for the new movement were available from the established church. The colleges of the land assured their qualified training. There were plenty of universities on the continent where preachers could be trained. For this reason there was no disposition to set up competing denominational colleges in the mother country.

Moreover, as Tewksbury points out, Methodists in England under Wesley did not consider themselves a church. They did not profess to be a church. They were simply a society for the promotion of a revival of religion within the Church of England (Wesley never formally left

---

[1]Halford E. Luccock and Paul Hutchinson, The Story of Methodism (New York: Methodist Book Concern, 1926), p. 361.

the national church), and the educational institutions of the home country sufficed.[1]

With the colonizing of the new world it was inevitable that among immigrants to America there should be a liberal sprinkling of Methodists. Because Wesley was unwilling to break from the Church of England, he was reluctant to authorize American Methodists to do so. Therefore, cut off from the parent body by impossible distances and a new social and environmental setting which demanded new techniques to meet frontier needs, it was by necessity that American Methodists became a church unto themselves.

American Methodists were not quick to found colleges because they were a new organization, and while they were becoming established they considered other things more important. They inherited enough preachers with Anglican training from the mother country to supply them for a while. Also, there was a period of time in early colonial days when higher emphasis was placed on evangelistic fervor than upon learning and scholarship.[2] For some years, therefore, early American Methodists did not demand a highly educated ministry.

However, there were colleges being formed. And practically all of the colleges established between the Revolution and the Civil War were organized, supported, and largely controlled by religious interests.[3]

---

[1]Arnold G. Tewksbury, The Founding of American Colleges and Universities (New York: Teachers College, Columbia University, 1932), p. 109.

[2]Ibid., p. 90.

[3]Ibid., p. 55.

A chronological roll call of the first nine colleges founded on the Atlantic seaboard reveals not a single Methodist school among the total group. Among them were three Congregational colleges, three Anglican schools, and one each sired by the Presbyterians, Baptists, and Dutch Reformed.[1]

One reason why there were no Methodist colleges among these first nine schools is because Methodism had not been established at the time of the first waves of migration from the old world to the new. The first nine colleges represented groups which came to America in search of religious freedom. In order to accomplish their primary ends they set up strong autonomous governmental societies wherein often their concepts of the church and the state appeared to be interdependent. Their colleges became symbols of their faith and they felt a need to control them.

Methodists did not colonize, but filtered into many of the thirteen states. At first they endeavored to follow the same pattern of living in the new world as they had in the old, but the day finally came when they found it impossible to maintain their existence and influence without organizing schools.[2]

The Presbyterians were most active in founding American colleges during the first decade of the nineteenth century; the Baptists entered higher education in the 1820's; and it was not until the 1830's that the Methodists began to build colleges in earnest.

---

[1]According to Tewksbury, the first nine colleges established in America were: Harvard (Congregational), William and Mary (Anglican), Yale (Congregational), Princeton (Presbyterian), Columbia (Anglican), Pennsylvania (Anglican), Brown (Baptist), Rutgers (Dutch Reformed), and Dartmouth (Congregational). Ibid., p. 109.

[2]Ibid., p. 110.

A chronological roll call of the first nine colleges founded on the Atlantic seaboard reveals not a single Methodist school among the total group. Among them were three Congregational colleges, three Anglican schools, and one each sired by the Presbyterians, Baptists, and Dutch Reformed.[1]

One reason why there were no Methodist colleges listed among the first nine schools is because these schools represented groups which came to the new world in search of religious freedom. They set up strong autonomous governmental societies. To them the concepts of the church and the state became synonymous. Their colleges were symbols of their faith and they felt a need to control them. This demand for colleges and their concept of church and state came out of their Calvinism, which drove them to America.

Methodists did not colonize, but filtered into many of the thirteen states. At first they endeavored to follow the same pattern of living in the new world as they had in the old, but the day finally came when they found it impossible to maintain their existence and influence without organizing schools.[2]

The Presbyterians were most active in founding American colleges during the first decade of the nineteenth century; the Baptists entered higher education in the 1820's; and it was not until the 1830's that the Methodists began to build colleges in earnest.

---

[1]According to Tewksbury, the first nine colleges established in America were: Harvard (Congregational), William and Mary (Anglican), Yale (Congregational), Princeton (Presbyterian), Columbia (Anglican), Pennsylvania (Anglican), Brown (Baptist), Rutgers (Dutch Reformed), and Dartmouth (Congregational). Ibid., p. 109.

[2]Ibid., p. 110.

Francis Asbury had founded Ebenezer Academy in 1784. Cokesbury College was founded in Maryland in 1785. (It was named from a combination of the two early Methodist bishops, Coke and Asbury.) But in 1795 the school was destroyed by fire. A second building of Cokesbury College in Baltimore burned in 1796, and the idea of the Methodist college was temporarily abandoned. American Methodism's oldest college, Wesleyan University at Middletown, Connecticut, was founded in 1831.[1] By the time of the Civil War twenty-four Methodist colleges had been established, and following the split of The Methodist Church over slavery in 1844 the Methodist colleges split into two respective divisions: northern and southern.

After the American revolution, state universities developed as a result of the acceptance of the principle of separation of church and state by the original thirteen colonies. Henceforth by mutual agreement when state institutions of higher learning were established they were to be free from church control, and church colleges were to be free from state control.[2] This principle was incorporated in the constitutions of the twenty-one states which were admitted to the union before the Civil War and formed the pattern for the future.

In 1862 the Morrill Land Grant Act awarded substantial land and money grants to state colleges for the development of agricultural and mechanical arts.[3] This act had a profound influence on higher education, touching off a rapid expansion of state schools. There was also

---

[1] Luccock and Hutchinson, op. cit., pp. 362-63.

[2] Clarence P. Shedd, The Church Follows Its Students (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1938), p. 5.

[3] Ibid., pp. 3-6.

a scrambling among some of the sectarian colleges in quest of grants. Sparked by a fear of Romanism, the religious aspirations and needs of enthusiastic frontier-Americans, sectarian rivalries, opposition to rising secularism, and competitive struggle with public education forces for the control of education, the denominations and sects produced a number of schools in rapid succession. Two-thirds of these had no permanent hope for survival, but as a result of this competition the position of higher education was enhanced throughout America.[1]

Until the turn of the century the religious life at Methodist colleges and many state universities was characterized by traditional chapel services, by some courses in Bible and/or religion taught in the regular curriculum, and by voluntary activity of student Christian groups which were found on the campuses of other church-related colleges, and, to a marked degree, at many of the tax-supported schools. Most college presidents of church schools were ministers, and several presidents of state schools were clergymen.

Because the activity of the above mentioned voluntary Student Christian groups underlies the eventual decision of major denominations to follow their students to the campus with a program of supportive ministry, a review of the Student Christian Movement is in order at this time.

B. The Rise of the Student Christian Movement

A quick resumé of the history of religious movements in higher education in this country discloses that voluntary student Christian

---

[1] Ibid., p. 12.

societies of one kind or another have been a constant characteristic of American college life from its very beginnings in the eighteenth century.[1] These early student Christian societies appear to have been a natural outgrowth of colonial college life. Since the first colleges in America were church-related institutions which had as their primary motive the education of a clergy qualified to preach the Calvinistic doctrine of man's salvation through personal encounter with the Lord Jesus Christ, as well as the education of an informed laity who would be able to read the Holy Scriptures for the edification of their children and a continuing propagation of the Christian faith, it is no wonder that the more serious minded students in those days should bind themselves together into spontaneous collegiate and intercollegiate bunds.

Dr. C. P. Shedd relates the manner in which in 1806 a Williams College freshman by the name of Samuel J. Mills retired to a country meadow with four fellow classmates to pray for a revival on the college campus. When it began to rain they sought shelter in a near-by haystack. Out of that experience the first foreign missionary society of college students was formed "to effect in the persons of its members a mission or missions to the heathen."[2] This was the forerunner of the later famed Student Volunteer Movement which sent thousands of dedicated student graduates into mission fields around the world.

Voluntary student Christian organizations have continued to flourish on American college campuses of all types, and they have ignited

---

[1]Clarence P. Shedd, Two Centuries of Student Christian Movements (New York: Association Press, 1934), pp. 1-5.

[2]Ibid., p. 15.

many of the significant religious and social awakenings which have come out of our colleges during the last century.

The peculiar marks of the Student Christian Movement are catalogued by Dr. C. P. Shedd in his volume titled A Century of Christian Student Initiative.[1] They, in turn, furnish an accurate description of activities and trends of voluntary student Christian groups as they function on college campuses today. Dr. Shedd states that: (1) true Christian student work (which is a mark of the SCM) is indigenous and the creation of and by students themselves, (2) it is ecumenical, (3) it has strong social concern, (4) it discovers new ways of working to meet the demands of the times, (5) it is world minded, (6) it is intercollegiate, and (7) it is community conscious.[2]

A good example of such voluntary student Christian organizations which still function on today's college campuses are the respective members of the Student Christian Movement. They merit mention in some detail because of their vital contribution to the religious climate of the entire university community. Dr. C. P. Shedd defines the Student Christian Movement as "all those voluntary fellowships and student Christian associations that are a part of the student movements of thirteen denominations, the Y.M.C.A. AND Y.W.C.A., Student Volunteer Movement."[3]

These student Christian associations have played and are still playing an important role in higher education in the United States. They perform a vital function in uniting intellectual and religious

---

[1]Clarence P. Shedd, A Century of Christian Student Initiative (New York: Association Press, 1954), pp. 11-24.

[2]Ibid.

[3]Shedd, The Christian Scholar, p. 11.

spheres in a changing educational climate which has not always been tolerant toward the Christian witness.

Dr. H. D. Bollinger states that by 1856 there were 156 colleges and forty-six theological seminaries in the United States and that nearly one hundred religious societies of students had been organized on the campuses of these schools.[1]

Major organizational developments of importance to student work that took place before the end of the nineteenth century include the following: (1) the organization of student summer conferences, which have been a significant part of student Christian work for years; (2) the Inter-Seminary Movement, which became the theological section of the Intercollegiate Y.M.C.A. in 1898; (3) the Student Volunteer Movement, which has been mentioned; and (4) the formation of the World's Student Christian Federation, which was organized in 1895 under the leadership of Dr. John R. Mott and other international student leaders.[2]

C. Beginnings of Denominational Student Programs

In addition to the valuable contribution that has been made to higher education by the student Christian Associations, about the beginning of the second decade of the twentieth century a new type of voluntary student Christian organization germinated which was destined to grow into a large tree, the branches of which today spread over a score of campus denominational student groups. This new movement, which has been

---

[1] Hiel D. Bollinger, The Church is With Its Students, an elective unit of study for College Students published by The Abingdon-Cokesbury Press, New York-Nashville, p. 4.

[2] Ibid., pp. 5-6.

called the Church Student Movement,[1] was manifested in a noticeable increase in denominational foundations, clubs, centers, chaplains, college pastors, directors of religious activities, and coordinators of religion as the respective churches have endeavored to follow their students onto all types of campuses in the nation.

By 1900 so many new colleges of all types had been organized and so many students were attending them (it is estimated that sixty per cent of the students were enrolled at state and independent institutions) that a few denominational leaders began to visualize the growing need for following the students of their respective faiths onto the campuses of the larger state universities. Here, says Dr. Shedd, "was a great new missionary field."[2] There was definite need to furnish more spiritual guidance to students who enrolled at tax-supported schools than had been available to them through the ministry offered by near-campus parish churches or by volunteer student Christian groups like the Y.M.C.A. and Y.W.C.A.

And, since legal restrictions placed specific limitations upon religious interpretation at state universities, the way was opened for the development of a few university pastorates which were launched on an experimental basis during the first decade of the twentieth century.

The Presbyterians, Methodists, Congregationalists, Baptists, and the Disciples took the lead in establishing the university pastorate, which, in turn became the father of the Foundation movement.

---

[1]Clarence P. Shedd, Religion in the State Universities, a pamphlet printed by the Edward W. Hazen Foundation, 400 Prospect Street, New Haven, Conn., pp. 14-15.

[2]Shedd, The Church Follows its Students, p. 5.

This movement, which was indigenous to America, could rightly be called a denominational student movement because it represents the efforts of various churches to perform a more complete ministry to more students of their respective faiths who were enrolling at college in rising throngs. The movement was augmented by the spread and growth of many state and independent schools when it became clear that church-related schools could not accommodate mounting registrations. More students were attending state universities than had been enrolled in church-related schools of the respective denominations.

Adherents of respective faiths reasoned that if a dwindling proportion of their students enrolled in their own church colleges (where they could watch over their spiritual growth) they had an increased obligation to "follow" them into the public schools of higher learning. This church student movement also stemmed from a feeling that the church must educate its own students in the faith of their choice when the state was prohibited from so doing. Supporters of the Foundation movement felt that the establishing of denominational centers was the only way they could be assured that their students could be held close to the churches of their choice. Also there was a consensus that it was time that the work which was being carried on by the interdenominational (or non-denominational) campus student groups like the student Christian Associations needed to be augmented by more direct denominational ministry of the parent churches. The rising enrollment of Catholic and Jewish students at state universities and tax-supported schools dramatized a need for religious guidance for students of their respective faiths. Therefore, Newman clubs and Hillel foundations joined in the new educational venture. This venture was good,

because only then could the merits and the historical and cultural fundamentals of the three major faiths be evaluated and compared. Only then could they be viewed in their rightful perspective, as contributing important threads to the pattern of religion on the campus.

By 1955 the National Newman Club Federation had grown into an intercollegiate movement with national and regional conferences similar to those of the denominational foundations. There were four hundred ninety-three priests designated as chaplains, and forty-six of these were devoted to full time student work among Roman Catholic students. By the same date more than two hundred B'nai B'rith Hillel Foundations were sponsoring clubs for Jewish students serving 150,000 youth. Seventy-three of these were in large universities.[1]

Concerning the implications of this upsurge of regard for ministry to students of the other two major faiths, Dr. C. P. Shedd observes:

> It is a striking fact that the philosophy and pattern of church student work has proven to be as applicable for a ministry to the Roman Catholic and Jewish students as it is for the Protestants.[2]

Dr. Shedd also observes that two radical changes are taking place in regard to the work of voluntary student religious groups. First, there is a growing tendency for these groups to minister to the total body of the university community--students, faculty, administration, and staff. Secondly, there is a shifting of emphasis by the denominations in charge of foundations from a student work to a student movement philosophy.[3] If

---

[1]Clarence P. Shedd, "Religion in Higher Education, Retrospect and Prospect," The Christian Scholar, XXXVIII, No. 4. (December, 1955), p. 15.

[2]Ibid., p. 15.

[3]Ibid., pp. 12-13.

both of the above changes are true, the opportunity for the contemporary college student to encounter a larger concept of religion as the integrating factor which can unite all segments of learning into an intelligent whole will be enhanced. And also, as will be outlined in a later chapter, such a change opens the way for offering greater service to the student and university community by the pastor of the local near-campus church.

Acknowledgment must be made at this juncture of some of the federations and councils of student Christian groups which have played an important role in student work. In 1915 a University Committee of the Council of Church Boards of Education was created which was composed of administrative representatives of student Christian work in the different churches. This organization became the National Commission on University Work in 1938. This commission sponsors many cooperative student work enterprises. Mention should also be made of the formation of the following bodies and of their important contribution to student Christian work; the National Intercollegiate Christian Council which was composed of representatives of the Y.M.C.A., the Y.W.C.A., and the Student Volunteer Movement; and the United Christian Youth Movement, which was organized in 1934 to represent a united effort on the part of about forty religious agencies of the church and similar groups. During the years 1938-44 a number of Christian campus groups affiliated with the World's Student Christian Federation so that they became ecumenical in scope.

In 1944 the United Student Christian Council was formed to relate the Christian student agencies in their work on college campuses. This body affiliated with the World's Student Christian Federation. Dr. H. D.

Bollinger describes the Council as "the working together of all the campus Christian agencies of the United States."[1]

In 1956 three student Christian movements (United Student Fellowship, Disciples Student Fellowship, and Presbyterian U. .A.) gathered together to act on a merger proposal. The Methodist Student Movement agreed to join in the discussion with a view to action at a later date.[2] In May 1957, at Columbus, Ohio, the merger negotiating committee issued a report emphasizing the point of view of the original plan of merger. At this time the Evangelical United Brethren Church voted that it was ready to enter into the merger. The Disciples Fellowship expressed a favorable reaction but wished "to proceed slowly." The United Student Fellowship had a favorable attitude and was preparing to vote on the matter. The Westminster Fellowship requested time for further study. The Methodist Student Movement looked more closely at its basic position and decided to withdraw from the plan of merger to concentrate on search for Christian unity in the growing life of the United Student Christian Council.[3]

The United Student Christian Council is now formally known as The National Student Christian Federation. The new organization was formed in 1959.

---

[1] Shedd, The Church Follows its Students, p. 50.

[2] Plan of Merger of Several Student Christian Movements, a pamphlet issued by the Merger Committee of three Student Christian Fellowship Groups and distributed by the United Student Christian Council, 257 Fourth Avenue, New York 10, New York, November, 1956. Cited hereafter as the Merger Plan.

[3] Report of the Merger Negotiating Committee, a leaflet issued by the Merger Committee of four student Christian Movements reporting action taken at a meeting May 5-7, at Columbus, Ohio and distributed by the United Student Christian Council, 257 Fourth Avenue, New York 10, N.Y. Cited hereafter as Report of Merger Plan.

D. The Methodist Student Movement

With the development of Methodist colleges throughout the nation came a corresponding development of voluntary student Christian societies on their respective campuses. The close of the nineteenth century was marked by a rapid growth in state and independent schools of higher learning which signaled the development of a new religious movement that was concerned with the religious life of the students who were attending those colleges and universities.

Out of this concern the University Pastorate Movement was born, which was an attempt to employ associate ministers to direct the religious activities of the college students of their respective denominations.[1] In 1907, James C. Baker, who later became Bishop Baker, was called to Trinity Church, Urbana, Illinois, where he became the first Methodist university pastor. While there he developed the philosophy of the Wesley Foundation which helped to set the pattern for the student religious foundation work of other denominations at state universities and independent schools across the nation.[2]

During the 1900-1910 decade Wesley Foundations were started at Illinois, Wisconsin, and Michigan, and groundwork for them was prepared at other state schools. As has been noted earlier, Roman Catholics and Jewish student centers developed the Foundation pattern simultaneously to enjoy marked success at public schools of higher education.[3]

Mention of the Wesley Foundation, one of the oldest and most flourishing of the student movements, as it functions on the campuses

---

[1]Bollinger, op. cit., p. 8.

[2]Shedd, op. cit., p. 20.

[3]Seymour Smith, Religious Cooperation at State Universities (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1957), p. 5.

of state and independent colleges and universities, will be reserved until later, when its place in the total plan of the guidance of Methodist college and university student life will be analyzed.

At the Methodist General Conference in 1912 the Board of Education was authorized to begin a program designed to assist the local churches at near-campus situations in their important responsibility of holding their students to Christ and to the church.[1] Despite fears that support of student work at state schools might side-track funds and students from Methodist colleges, at the General Conference of 1916 national policies regarding financial support, leadership, and a working program for Wesley Foundation were adopted. And by 1920 the dreams of Bishop Baker had come true on the campuses of twenty state universities.[2]

Impressive strides were taken by the Board of Education of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South before unification toward the perfection of the Methodist Student Movement, which had as its ideal the extension of a Wesley Foundation type of program into all colleges where Methodist students were enrolled.

When eight hundred students and two hundred leaders of student work from the Methodist Episcopal Church, the Methodist Episcopal Church, South and the Methodist Protestant Church gathered at St. Louis during the final days of December, 1937, at the first National Student Conference (a session which the writer of this dissertation attended), they anticipated the union of Methodism by two years. Here is one example which demonstrates how student work in the three churches led the way toward

---

[1] Shedd, The Church Follows its Students, p. 50.

[2] Ibid., pp. 53-55.

final union. At this gathering they drew up plans for a national Methodist Student Movement which had from the first the ultimate objective of being affiliated with a United Student Christian Movement in the United States.[1]

The mechanics of the Methodist Student Movement had been so judiciously designed by the Board of Education and the Department of Schools and Colleges of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South that its program was adopted, virtually in entirety, as the prototype for future development of the united body. The new movement was interracial from its inception and completely disregarded the jurisdictions or sections into which united Methodism was destined to be divided, setting the Central Jurisdiction with Negroes off from the rest. The writer remembers taking part in one of the St. Louis Conference discussions which was provoked by the refusal of city hotels to house nationally known Negro leaders and delegates to the conference.

Since its conception the Methodist Student Movement has broadened its scope and functions in carrying out its responsibility for operation and maintenance of religious work among Methodist students enrolled in institutions of higher learning until its name has become an all-inclusive designation embracing student organizations, university churches and pastors, the religious program of Methodist colleges, and their student groups and directors of religious life. It also embraces Wesley Foundations, with their student groups and boards of directors, students and professional personnel; and the state movements, with their intercollegiate department; and a national Department of College and University Religious Life of the

---

[1] Ibid., pp. 117-18.

Board of Education working with similar departments in other boards and located at Nashville, Tennessee. In short, the Methodist Student Movement includes a great new emphasis of Methodism in the area of religion in higher education.[1]

Local basic units of the Methodist Student Movement which labor for Christ as they serve students are to be found in 636 centers across the nation where the Methodist Church is organized for student Christian work. These basic units include a wide category of distinctive types. Among them are 162 accredited Wesley Foundations located at state and independent schools, 118 schools and colleges related to the Methodist Board of Education, plus 356 other local centers where Methodism has some form of student Christian organization, either in a local campus situation or working with inter-denominational groups.[2]

Nearly 300 adults render full or part time service to student Christian work in the more than 600 above listed centers. Full time workers number over 200. It is estimated that this is a potential vocational field for the employment of 400 professionally trained workers. In addition to these professional student workers there are more than 600 pastors who preach to nearly one half million students as a part of their ministry to congregations of near-campus Methodist churches.[3] It

---

[1] The Methodist Student Movement, a leaflet published by the Department of College and University Religious Life of the Division of Educational Institutions of the Board of Education of The Methodist Church, Box 871, Nashville, Tennessee.

[2] Ibid.

[3] Professional Student Christian Work in The Methodist Church, a leaflet published by the Department of College and University Religious Life of the Division of Higher Education of the Board of Education of The Methodist Church, Box 871, Nashville, Tennessee.

is with the ministry of these university parish pastors as they touch the lives of students that this dissertation is essentially concerned.

The writer has already related how several student Christian movements decided to negotiate in a plan of merger. The Methodist Student Movement was a party to initial negotiations, but in 1957 it was decided that this proposed merger was not the best expression of unity for the Methodist Student Movement at the time. This was the decision of the National Methodist Student Commission, which is composed of state presidents of the various units of the Methodist Student Movement and other representatives of the United Student Christian Council and other bodies. This commission meets once a year as a part of the work of the National Conference of Methodist Youth.[1]

E. The Philosophy of Methodist Student Work

At this point the writer will describe briefly the philosophy of college and university religious work of the Methodist Church and how it plays a significant part in the ministry of the university parish pastor to student life. According to the 1960 Discipline of The Methodist Church, the Board of Education was authorized to create a Division of Higher Education "which shall represent The Methodist Church in activities connected with secondary, higher, and ministerial education."[2] This division has

---

[1]The Methodist Student Movement, Annual Report for 1958, a pamphlet issued by the Department of College and University Religious Life of the Division of Higher Education of the Board of Education of The Methodist Church at Nashville, Tennessee.

[2]The Methodist Church, Doctrines and Disciplines of The Methodist Church (Nashville: The Methodist Publishing House, 1960), Cited hereafter as the Discipline for 1960.

an advisory relationship with all Methodist educational institutions in the United States affiliated with The Methodist Church. They include universities, colleges, secondary schools, schools of theology, and Wesley Foundations and similar organizations. The division operates through three constituent departments: Educational Institutions, College and University Religious Life, and Ministerial Education.[1]

In regard to the second of the above-mentioned departments through which the Division of Higher Education of the Methodist Board of Education functions, the writer notes that a Department of College and University Religious Life has been created with headquarters at Nashville, Tennessee. This body is charged with the following responsibilities: (1) the organization and maintenance of Wesley Foundations at tax-supported and independent colleges and universities; (2) assisting in religious activities at Methodist Colleges; and (3) the study of the religious needs of students, the assisting in evangelistic work among them, and the enlistment of candidates for full time Christian service.[2]

The Department of College and University Religious Life has been developing a statement on the philosophy of college and university religious work. A brief statement of how this philosophy was developed, together with a summary of some of its important provisions is now presented.

In order to do a better job of following Methodist students to the campus and further to discharge the objectives of the Board of Education, a Methodist Student Workers' Association was formed at Nashville in 1949. This body purposed to codify a philosophy of college and

---

[1] Ibid., p. 374.

[2] Ibid., p. 379.

university religious work which had been evolving through years of study at every level of Methodist professional student workers. The name of this association was later changed to the Association of College and University Ministers of the Methodist Church.[1] This association included the more than 600 university parish pastors who are now affiliated with the Methodist Student Movement, but chiefly those preachers who were designated as college pastors with specific campus responsibilities.

In 1956 the Association adopted a formal statement of objectives containing four sections; namely, (1) a theological affirmation, (2) some basic principles, (3) general objectives, and (4) the approach of the Church to the campus. The statement summarized fundamental essentials which express the "reason for being" of the Methodist college religious movement under ten headings which describe the nature of the university community, the nature of the Christian gospel and the obligation of the Methodist Church to witness to the campus and to the total university community, and closes with this statement: "The Methodist Church embraces all efforts of Methodism to witness in and through the university, seeking to achieve the highest qualitative level of effectiveness and faithfulness."[2]

Sixteen general objectives are listed, beginning with the aim of leading all members of the college and university community to accept the Christian faith in God. Increased knowledge and use of the Bible, a deepening of the Christian faith, the development of Christian social concern, witnessing to the total campus community, development of

---

[1] The Philosophy of College and University Religious Work of The Methodist Church, a pamphlet issued by the Department of College and University Religious Life of the Division of Higher Education of the Board of Education of The Methodist Church, Box 871, Nashville, Tennessee. Cited hereafter as Philosophy of Methodist Student Work.

[2] Ibid.

intercollegiate and ecumenical understanding, commitment in Christian stewardship, Christian interpretation of vocations, the development of religious life as an integral part in the program of higher education, and the creation of campus concern for missions are other featured objectives proposed.[1]

In section four, titled "The Church's Approach to the Campus," the statement defines the nature of the college and university religious movement of the Methodist Church which has been organized to minister to those within the campus Christian community as "The Methodist Church at work on the campus, undergirded by the prayers, the financial support, and the heart felt blessing of the total church at every level."[2]

According to the statement:

> On every campus . . . the Church should be present with some sort of organized group, which group in itself is the arm of the Church extended to the campus. This group, being an educational unit of the Church, ministers to the deepest needs of faculty and students, always conducting a comprehensive religious program.[3]

Included in this section there is a statement relating to the ministry of the local parish Methodist church which is near the campus and geared to the experience of the college and university community. This statement suggests that often the local church and the parish pastor will be the best means which that community can offer for meeting the spiritual needs of faculty, administration, married students with their families, and other students.[4]

---

[1] Ibid.

[2] Ibid.

[3] Ibid.

[4] Ibid.

The statement closes with an appendix noting the various ways in which the churches of Methodism are related to the college and university religious movement on campuses of American institutions of higher learning. These ways, to which later reference will be made, are of significance to this study because they concern the role which the university parish pastor plays in the entire scheme of Methodist impact upon the campus community. They are listed as follows: (1) through Boards of Directors, Campus-Church Relations Committees and/or Committees on Campus Religious Life of Wesley Foundations, Clubs, or organized Methodist student groups; (2) through Annual Conference Boards of Education and/or Inter Conference Commissions on Student Work; and (3) through the Board of Education of the Methodist Church through its division of Higher Education, and through the Department of College and University Religious Life.[1]

F. The General Conference Quadrennial Emphasis

By 1956 the need for concerted undergirding of the goals of higher education as proposed by the Methodist church since the inception of that body became so urgent that the General Conference prescribed an emphasis on higher education as one of two major long range objectives of the quadrennial program for the years 1956-60. The second major objective of the 1956 quadrennial program was an emphasis on enriching the local church.

Because this action of the 1956 session of the General Conference occupies an important place in the development of the place of the university parish pastor as a key person in the implementing of the goals of

---

[1] Ibid.

Christian higher education at the level of the university, some of the significant acts of legislations of that body are recounted at this juncture. They do not appear in the 1960 edition of the Methodist Discipline. Therefore, in order that they may retain their rightful place in background information provided by this dissertation, and in order that they may be observed with proper perspective, they are reviewed here.

That the two emphases of the 1956 General Conference (higher education and the local church) complemented one another and merited one hundred per cent promotion and the backing of the entire denomination is attested by the following statement from paragraph 2018 of the 1956 Methodist Discipline which outlined the quadrennial program for the years 1956 to 1960:

> The Church is in the world to capture the hearts of men and to make them faithful disciples of the Nazarene and also to capture their minds and establish them in the truth that leads to abundant and unending life. By missions and evangelism we extend the frontiers of that Kingdom. By education we build the city of God. These are two phases of one magnificent enterprise.[1]

The importance of the dual aim of this quadrennial program was emphasized by this excerpt from section four of the same paragraph of the Methodist Discipline:

> For more than two centuries the Methodist movement has been a stalwart patron of education. Its beginning may be traced to Oxford university. John Wesley, our spiritual father, was a scholar as well as an evangelist. His spiritual zeal . . . had coupled with it a trained and discerning mind. As the Methodist movement pushed westward over the American continent, it left in its wake schools as well as churches . . . Many of them remain, and they are the church's indispensable asset. Such is our heritage.

---

[1]The Methodist Church, Doctrines and Disciplines of The Methodist Church (Nashville: The Methodist Publishing House, 1956), p. 696. Cited hereafter as the Discipline for 1956.

> The perils and opportunities of the present challenge us more insistently than the heritage of yesterday. We live in an age of moral confusion. Materialism and Communism defy the Christian concept of God and man. The centuries prove that the Christian Church builds itself into the culture of a people through its institutions of learning. We look forward to the day when our institutions of learning, committed to the Christian ideal, shall occupy as pivotal a position in the total program of the Methodist Church as missions and evangelism.[1]

Recognizing that an organized church-wide effort to expand and to strengthen the Methodist educational program in America was overdue, the 1956 General Conference adopted a plan for dramatizing the mission of the church in the field of higher education and for strengthening our colleges and universities for more effective service. The Conference also urged that the same strong arm of support be placed under institutions of higher learning in other lands as well, so that the total emphasis would be world and Kingdom-wide.

The 1956 General Conference empowered the new emphasis on higher education by setting up a Quadrennial Commission on Higher Education composed of all the effective Bishops resident in the United States, Bishops from the Central Conferences, representative pastors and laymen from each jurisdiction, several members of the Board of Education, the general secretaries of the Board of Education, the Division of World Missions and the Board of Missions, and twenty additional members elected at large on account of their experience and ability in the field of education.[2]

Procedures recommended to the commission as it organized its forces to function during the quadrennium included: (1) the strengthening

---

[1] Ibid., pp. 701-02.

[2] Ibid., pp. 696-97.

of bonds that tie our institutions of higher learning to the Church; (2) leading our schools and colleges to a higher commitment of Christian standards and undergirding them with adequate moral and financial support; (3) promoting the work of Wesley Foundations and student centers and making their work more effective on college campuses; (4) interpreting to our Church-related colleges and universities their place and formation in the life of the church, and serving the college youth of the local churches, conferences, and areas from which they receive their support; (5) interpreting to Methodists the distinctive functions of our institutions of learning in the church and in society; (6) the organization of a School of International Service at Washington, D.C.; (7) the creation of Quadrennial Committees in the respective annual Conferences; (8) an appeal to Methodist members of the Conferences for annual financial support; and (9) an appeal to Methodist people to leave something in their wills for some institution of learning related to the church.[1]

Cognizant of the persistent battle being waged against the Christian faith by the forces of atheism, naturalism, Communism, secularism, and fearful because man has the elements of destruction within his grasp to commit atomic suicide, the quadrennial program statement declared that a new spirit must be born in the heart of man through the proclamation of the gospel of Christ. Through evangelism and education (the emphases of the quadrennium) the church must develop in man the mind that was in Christ Jesus.[2] According to the statement,

---

[1] Ibid., pp. 697-701.

[2] Ibid., pp. 688-91.

> This mind must be inspired by the teaching and preaching of the local church and must be revealed in the practices of the local community. The mind that was in Christ must become regnant in the thought of each succeeding generation of students in the educational institutions of his Church.[1]

Because the quadrennial program adopted by the General Conference of 1956 was based on the conviction that man's mind must be mastered by the mind that was in Christ Jesus, the program was, therefore, "conceived in evangelistic and educational terms, designing to bring the full power of the local churches and the educational institutions of the Methodist to the realization of this objective.[2]

G. General Conference Action for the Present Quadrennium

It is reassuring to note that as a result of General Conference action in 1960 two major additions or revisions have been written into Chapter VIII of the Methodist Discipline which outline advances of the Board of Education in relation to religion in higher education on the American campus.

A first major addition is created by the re-formulation and re-writing of paragraph 1351 of the 1960 Discipline which was formerly titled Division of Educational Institutions. This paragraph is now titled Division of Higher Education and begins with a new opening statement as follows:

> Higher Education is a part of both our Methodist heritage and our present task. In establishing and maintaining educational institutions and in ministering to students the church continues its historic work of uniting knowledge and vital piety.[3]

---

[1] Ibid., p. 689.

[2] Ibid., p. 690.

[3] Discipline for 1960, pp. 373-74.

Section two of the same paragraph calls for the creation of a Division of Higher Education

> which shall represent The Methodist Church in all activities connected with secondary, higher, and ministerial education. The division shall have an advisory relationship to all educational institutions in the United States affiliated with The Methodist Church; universities, colleges, secondary schools, schools of theology, and Wesley Foundations and similar organizations. On request it may serve in advisory capacity to the several agencies of the church owning or administering educational institutions.[1]

Section three of the same paragraph reads:

> Its principle objectives shall be: (a) to develop an educational plan and purpose which shall definitely relate the educational institutions of the church to the church; (b) to foster within them the highest educational standards and soundest business practices; (c) to interpret to them their place and function in the life and work of the church; (d) to encourage them in their commitment to Christian standards and ideals in their teaching, policies and practices; (e) to create and maintain within them an atmosphere conducive to a knowledge and understanding of the Christian message and mission; (f) to interpret to the membership of the church the distinctive services rendered by these educational institutions and their functions in the church and society; and (g) to lead the church in a program designed to assure their permanence, efficiency, academic excellence, and Christian commitment.[2]

Sections four, five and six read as follows:

> 4. It shall operate through three constituent departments: Educational Institutions, College and University Religious Life, and Ministerial Education.
>
> 5. It shall elect, on nomination of the general secretary, directors for each of the departments, and such other staff members as are needed for the operation of the division.
>
> 6. It shall engage personnel, appoint such commissions and committees and adopt such regulations as necessary for the discharge of its responsibilities.[3]

The second major addition noted in Chapter VIII of the 1960 Discipline is the authorization of the Board of Education to create a Conference

---

[1] Ibid., p. 324.

[2] Ibid.

[3] Ibid.

Committee on Christian Higher Education. This matter is covered by a new paragraph numbered 1452 which states:

> The board [Board of Education] shall constitute a Conference Committee on Christian Higher Education, composed of not fewer than eight of its members selected in consultation with the bishop and the cabinet. This committee shall have the specific responsibility for developing knowledge of and support for the schools, colleges, universities, schools of theology, and Wesley Foundations related to The Methodist Church and particularly those related to the conference.[1]

In addition to authority given to the Board of Education to form a Conference Committee on Christian Higher Education, paragraph 1452 of the Discipline empowers an Annual Conference, at its discretion, to enlarge the committee into a Conference Commission on Christian Higher Education. The composition of this Commission and its duties are described in section two of paragraph 1452.[2]

This paragraph also authorizes the creation of an Area or Regional Commission on Christian Higher Education by two or more Annual Conferences, at their discretion. The composition and duties of this Commission may be found in section three of paragraph 1452.[3]

In the light of General Conference Action in May of 1960, the Wesley Foundation is re-defined as "the organized educational ministry through which The Methodist Church makes a unified approach to the tax-supported or independent college or university.[4] The organization, functions, and program of the Wesley Foundation are also stated. Also,

---

[1] Ibid., p. 408.

[2] Ibid.

[3] Ibid.

[4] Ibid., p. 380.

the continuation of the Methodist Student Movement is authorized. This body has been described previously, but it is mentioned here again to show how it fits into the whole pattern of Christian higher education in The Methodist Church.

A National Conference of the Methodist Student Movement was authorized at the last session of the General Conference "for the purpose of fellowship, evaluation, and program planning in areas that relate to student work."[1] Also, Annual Conference Boards of Education of states or regions were ordered to create or to provide for the continuing at the beginning of each quadrennium a Conference or Interconference Commission on College and University Student Work to coordinate at the intercollegiate work of Methodist Student Movement and to give general oversight to student work at colleges and universities within the prescribed states or regions.[2]

In closing this section of comment on recent action of the General Conference in the interest of student work, the writer calls attention to two important pieces of legislation enacted at the last session of the General Conference which are of significant import to student work and which were not reported in the 1960 edition of the Discipline. Accounts concerning them may be found in the Daily Christian Advocate which reported the daily proceedings of the conference.

The first matter of importance which should be mentioned here concerns a motion made by Dr. Harold C. Case, the president of Boston University, which was duly seconded and carried. It was stated as follows:

---

[1] Ibid., p. 381.

[2] Ibid., p. 382.

> The [Wesley] Foundation shall be related functionally and cooperatively through its Board of Directors to The Methodist Church or churches in the immediate vicinity of the college or university.[1]

By this action the General Conference made very clear the relationship of the Foundations to the university parish church. The passing of this motion also indicated that the relationship of the pastor who serves such a church would become even more strategic than before.

The second piece of legislation of import to Methodist student work which was not reported in the 1960 Discipline was Report Number Three of the Coordinating Council which is reproduced here from the Daily Christian Advocate:

> The Committee on Christian Higher Education was established in 1956 to give leadership to the section of the quadrennial program on Christian Higher Education . . . the quadrennial program achieved substantial progress in making our whole constituency aware of the importance of adequate financial support of our educational institutions. The Coordinating Council agrees that in the new quadrennium the work for Christian Higher Education is to return to "normalcy."
>
> We recommend that the responsibility assigned to the Commission on Higher Education during the last quadrennium be now assigned to the Division of Educational Institutions of the Board of Education and that the General Conference Committee on Education consider the advisability of incorporating the relevant material in paragraph 2018 of the 1956 Discipline in the section which deals with the Division and that the responsibility of the Commission on Higher Education in the Annual Conference now shall be assigned to the Conference Board of Education and shall be given accelerated emphasis.[2]

A third important action taken by the 1960 session of the General Conference which was not reported in the last edition of the Discipline

---

[1] The Daily Christian Advocate (Denver), May 9, 1960, p. 20. Report No. 1 of the Coordinating Council of the General Conference of The Methodist Church.

[2] The Daily Christian Advocate (Denver), April 27, 1960, p. 23. Report No. 3 of the Coordinating Council of the General Conference of The Methodist Church.

and which will strengthen the support of student work at university centers where Methodist work is being carried on was the request that the Annual Conference Committees on Higher Education shall recommend to their respective Boards of Education for presentation to their respective Annual Conferences a minimum goal of an amount equal to $1.00 per member annually for the support of educational institutions, with the understanding that an additional sum of thirty cents per member annually be recommended for Wesley Foundations. This goal is to be increased to $1.50 per member annually for educational institutions and to fifty cents annually per member for Wesley Foundations. And:

> Where no educational institution or Wesley Foundation is related to the conference, the committee or the commission shall recommend to the annual conference Board of Education for presentation to the annual conference the method of distributing to Methodist educational institutions, either directly or through the Division of Higher Education, the funds for higher education.[1]

H. The Key Role of the University Parish Pastor

It is precisely at this point that the university parish pastor who serves the local near-campus Methodist Church (and who plays the leading role in this study) fits into the whole scheme of the Methodist college and university religious movement as it endeavors to minister to the college community.

The ministry of the university parish pastor is seen to be geared in one or more of the following ways into service to students at more than 600 centers throughout the nation where the Methodist church is

---

[1] General Conference Actions on Higher Education, 1960-64, Leaflet No. 2008-EI, issued by the Division of Higher Education of the Board of Education of The Methodist Church. Quoting from Report No. 31, Committee on Education, Calendar 101, of the Daily Christian Advocate, pages 367 and 368.

organized for some type of student work: (1) through the Methodist Student Movement; (2) through the required local Board of Directors, Campus-Church Relations Committees and/or Committees on Campus Religious Life of the Wesley Foundation, Club, or organized Methodist student group; (3) through the "commission" of the near-campus church as it relates to students; (4) through the purpose and intent of the presiding bishop who appoints the pastor; and (5) through the nature of the student and his growing spiritual nurture which demands it. A brief consideration of each of the above is in order because of its bearing on the study.

All Methodist pastors who preach in Methodist Churches nearest to campuses at more than 600 university centers across the nation are listed in the Directory of the Methodist Student Movement, which, as defined previously, is an all-inclusive movement embracing the total Methodist effort to minister to the college and university community.[1] This directory which is issued annually by the Department of College and University Religious Life of the Board of Education of the Methodist Church, constitutes a directory of Methodist colleges, Wesley Foundations, Inter-denominational organizations and other locally organized campus Christian units of the Methodist Student Movement. By virtue of their membership in the Methodist Student Movement these university parish pastors who are listed in the MSM directory automatically have relationship to student work and ministry to the university community.

Paragraph 1365 of the Discipline of the Methodist Church provides for the establishing of a governing body for student groups which shall be composed of either a Board of Directors (if Wesley Foundation), or a

---

[1] The Directory of the Methodist Student Movement.

Campus-Church Relations Committee, or a Committee on Campus Religious Life (if some other type of student group is indicated). The Discipline states:

> There shall be a governing body for the student work in every college community where The Methodist Church is at work, as follows:
>
> 1. For each Wesley Foundation there shall be a Board of Directors as described in paragraph 1366.
>
> 2. The division shall encourage each Methodist-related college or university to establish a Committee on Campus Religious Life, which may also serve as a Campus-Church Relations Committee, and to state qualifications and define duties of the committee in consultation with the division.
>
> 3. For each other institution there shall be a Campus-Relations Committee nominated by a local Methodist body and elected by the Conference Board of Education.[1]

Thus, it is observed that the creation of either a Board of Directors, a Committee on Campus Religious Life or a Campus-Church Relations Committee in every college community where the Methodist Church is at work is mandatory. The local pastor of the university parish church automatically becomes a member of one or other of these governing bodies (in case of the Wesley Foundation frequently the local pastor is Associate Director or even Director).

In case the Board of Directors of the Wesley Foundation is the governing body for student work at a school where Methodist student work is carried on, the proper connection between that body and the university parish church is now clearly defined, in that this body "shall be related functionally and cooperatively though its Board of Directors to The Methodist Church or churches in the immediate vicinity of the college or university."[2]

---

[1] Discipline for 1960, p. 379.

[2] The Daily Christian Advocate, May 9, 1960, p. 20.

In case the Campus-Church Relations Committee or the Committee on Campus Religious Life is the governing body for student work at a school where Methodist student work is carried on, such committees are designed to assist and advise the local church and pastor concerning their student program. These committees are also empowered to work with the local pastor and the parish church in the matter of raising funds from the local church for student work. The implications are that these committees will serve as co-ordinators of all religious activities in which the college or the university and the church mutually share. This kind of a close working-relationship with the local near-campus church requires a close working-relationship with the pastor of the university church.

The ministry of the university parish church is also related to students through the specific commission of this church to recognize its obligation to serve as a university church in its truest sense.

In this regard it seems reasonable to assume that the local university parish pastor ought to: (1) be chosen for his particular training and experience to preach and minister to the needs of the university community in a relevant manner; (2) aid the near-campus church in setting up an adequate program for religious education for students served by the church; (3) cooperate in developing a unified and harmonious approach to the religious needs of the faculty, students, administration, and the entire university community; and (4) develop churchmanship among those students and faculty members who choose to relate themselves to the local parish church.[1]

---

[1]The University Senate of The Methodist Church, Religion in the Church College, a pamphlet prepared under the direction of The Committee on Campus Religious Life, composed of representatives of Methodist Colleges and staff members of the Division of Higher Education, Board of Education of The Methodist Church (Nashville: 1953), pp. 26-27. Cited hereafter as Religion in the College Church.

When a Methodist pastor is assigned to a university parish church he takes special authority from the presiding Bishop who appoints him, and from the Cabinet which concurs in the appointment. The General Superintendents and the District Superintendents of the respective Annual Conferences are aware of their peculiar responsibility to appoint pastors of proper training and experience to university parish pulpits. When a Methodist pastor is appointed to a university parish pulpit, automatically he inherits the obligation that goes with it--to fulfill his assigned part and function in the college and university religious movement.

The unique nature of the student and the opportunities which are his challenge and demand the friendly guidance of the local parish pastor. The student is unique. On the campus for a limited number of years, he has opportunities which he will never have again. He has access to the laboratories, the libraries, the wisdom of the past, and the fellowship of faculty and students who shape his vocation and control his destiny. If while he is there his life may be shaped and molded by the nature of his academic environment, his religious bent also may be nurtured through the church which seeks him out and challenges him to active participation by helping him to grow into a mature and integrated person. Many students come to college who have never been inside a church building, and it is reasonable to assume that the only contact they may ever have with the body of Christ is when the arm of the church reaches out to them in friendly invitation while they are in college. Perhaps never again will they be as open or as available for evangelizing. Also, many come from churches from which they will sever connection if their relationship is not sustained. The nature and the needs of the student demand that the local university parish pastor have a relationship with the student which is more dynamic than casual.

In this total drama of emphasis on religion in higher education by the entire Methodist Church throughout its Boards, Committees, Annual Conferences, Areas, and the General Conference, the role played by the university parish pastor is a strategic one. He becomes one of the key persons responsible for the success of the enterprise. The instrument which has been skillfully designed to lengthen and strengthen the arm of service to Methodist students provides him with an opportunity and an obligation--an opportunity to enhance his ministry to students, and a sacred obligation which he dare not disregard.

These are conclusive reasons for appointing the right man to the university parish church and for offering him adequate training and resources to complement his working-relation with the university community.

I. Summary

By way of summary, this chapter began with a description of the continual and growing interest which the Methodist church has manifested in following its students into all types of college and university communities throughout the nation. The history of religion in higher education as related to Methodist students has been traced from voluntary types of student Christian organizations of the nineteenth century through the establishing of the first university pastorates which were the parents of Wesley Foundation and the Methodist Student Movement.

The rise of the Student Christian Movement and the important role which that organization played in the beginnings of denominational student programs has been recounted. In this chapter the writer has described the nature and the operation of the Methodist Student Movement and how it relates to the local parish church, to conference agencies, and to the

ecumenical student movements. He has indicated how the Methodist Student Movement is related to the university parish pastor and how this pastor is related to the Methodist Student Movement. He has explained the ramifications of the organization which has been designed by The Methodist Church for facilitating the cause of religion in higher education.

The writer outlined the functions of the Department of College and University Religious Life of the Division of Higher Education of the Board of Education as they relate to student work and to the university parish pastor. He explained how the philosophy of Methodist student work evolved and how it is a growing philosophy. In order that the reader might not lose sight of the Quadrennial Emphasis on Higher Education by the General Conference of 1956 for the last quadrennium (because much of this material is not reported in the 1960 Discipline), the writer reviewed the important resolutions and actions which were passed by that legislative body. A review of the 1960 General Conference actions on higher education designed for the present quadrennium was included. The chapter closed with an explanation of the key role that is played by the university parish pastor in this entire drama.

This chapter has been presented as the last of a series of chapters of background material which were designed by the writer to show how the preaching pastor of the university parish church fits into the total Methodist scheme of ministering to students while they are at college. The writer has gone to some length to dramatize the way in which the entire Methodist Church follows its students to the campus, and the unique place which is occupied by the university parish pastor in the total pattern of the college and university religious movement.

On the assumption that the university parish pastor has a unique ministry to perform as he relates to students in the university community, it was a part of the writer's original hypothesis that the prototype of an ideal university parish pastor could be projected as a model against which to measure the actual performance of contemporary university parish pastors throughout the nation. The next two chapters deal with the projection of this "ideal" pastor.

CHAPTER V

THE IDEAL UNIVERSITY PARISH PASTOR: QUALIFICATIONS

The ideal university parish pastor doesn't exist. The perfection demanded of him could never become incarnate in human form. Nevertheless, a concept of such an ideal pastor can be conjectured. He is a composite person, made up of various parts. His qualifications and his functions may be projected. In this chapter the writer will attempt to project the qualifications of such an ideal pastor, and in the following chapter he will project the specific functions of this pastor as they relate to student life in the university community.

There are probably few professional men upon whom greater diversity of demands is made in the performance of their work than the pastor who serves the parish of a near-campus church in a university community. He must be priest, pastor, preacher, counselor, teacher, evangelist, and administrator not only to the local Methodist Church which calls him as pastor; but also he must relate in many ways to students, faculty, administration, local alumni, and the entire university community.

Such a dual responsibility involving a multiplicity of ramifications is exacting. Ministering to the spiritual and temporal requirements of the average congregation is a full time job itself, replete with all the obligations that a single pastor can handle. To add to it a second load of obligations involving a different set of problems--such as ministry to the university community demands--necessitates the maintenance

of a constant tension between what a single individual can accomplish and what he knows he ought to be doing. It is obvious that the performance of any pastor in such a dual role is difficult. Yet, as has already been indicated, more than 600 Methodist pastors are called to such appointments in the United States.

The qualifications of the ideal university parish pastor may be considered under two major classifications--general qualifications and formal training.

A. General Qualifications

The general qualifications of the ideal university parish pastor should include personal, spiritual, and inspirational insight, as well as suitable scholastic ability and experience. A brief sketch outlining these qualifications follows:

1. Personal, Spiritual, and Inspirational Insight

That the ideal university parish pastor should be called of God to a specific ministry is assumed. When called to such a pulpit he might well preface his acceptance of such an appointment by a frank self-analysis. He should scrutinize his own personal motives for deciding on the Christian ministry as a profession. He should ask himself these questions. Was his call honestly of God, or is he (consciously or unconsciously) using it for purposes of exhibition, ego-lifting, or an opportunity to exercise authority or control over others? Does he love people? Does he love students? Does he covet for students a divine encounter with the Almighty? Is he interested primarily in the spiritual, social, and intellectual growth of students as integrated persons coming alive in the Kingdom of God? Does he know God and love him?

Harold F. Carr says, "The college preacher who does most for his students is the one who knows God."[1] He must also possess a contagious sense of humor and that intangible quality of personality which enables him to relate easily to students with rapport on the level of their interests.

Moreover, he should play his part in what Sir Walter Moberly calls the creation of "a community of Christians."[2] And if Hoxie N. Fairchild is correct when he says, "The college should be a community of enquirers . . . each of whom is striving to arrive at a philosophy,"[3] then the university parish pastor is obligated to play an integral role in helping the college or university to develop that philosophy which is of the Divine Mind.

That the ideal university parish pastor should be as well qualified for his task as the college chaplain or university pastor is not debatable. In addition, he should be an acceptable preacher. Following a survey of 1,760 Methodist ministers in an attempt to measure the source of supply of clergymen, the Rev. J. A. Geissinger, former pastor of the University Methodist Church at Los Angeles, remarked, "If I could get the ears of the bishops I'd say to them, 'Select carefully the men who are to be pastors at the seats of our state universities, for there our losses are appalling.'"[4] Although this observation was made nearly a half-century ago it has contemporary implications.

---

[1]Harold F. Carr, "The College Preacher," Religion in Higher Education, ed. Milton Towner (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1931), p. 157.

[2]Sir. Walter Moberly, The Crisis in the University (London: SCM Press Ltd., 1949), p. 261.

[3]Hoxie N. Fairchild, Religious Perspectives of College Teaching in Literature, a pamphlet published by the Edward W. Hazen Foundation, New Haven, Conn., p. 6.

[4]Shedd, The Church Follows Its Students, p. 48.

Denominational officials of the Disciples of Christ share a similar opinion, according to the minutes of their National Advisory Council for Student Work, and regretfully concede, "Ministers in many student situations have not been chosen because they can minister effectively to students."[1]

Following an analysis of Methodist student work at twenty-eight colleges and universities of three western states, Dr. Murray Leiffer, Professor of Sociology at Garrett Biblical Institute, makes the following observations:

> The senior pastor in the near-campus church should, in every case, maintain a vital interest in the campus and students; and should expect to give time to campus contacts, counseling of students, etc. A man who is not interested in student life should not be appointed to such a church.[2]

Leiffer also has discovered that where the preaching pastor at a university situation does not actually share some of the responsibility for student work there is a natural tendency on his part to lose contact with it, giving his full time to the parish responsibilities of his regular membership.[3]

2. Scholastic Ability and Experience

There seems to be a general agreement that it is important for university parish pastors to be chosen for their educational qualifications as well as for their ability to serve believers in a university community. They should be men who understand the needs of students and

---

[1] Ibid., pp. 223-24.

[2] Murray H. Leiffer, Methodist Student Work at the Colleges of Arizona, California, and Nevada (Upland, Indiana: A. D. Freese and Sons, 1951), p. 102.

[3] Ibid.

the university mind and can speak in a manner that is relevant to both. According to a report of the Committee on Campus Religious Life, composed of college representatives and staff members of the Methodist Board of Education, every possible effort should be made to secure the cooperation of the Bishop and Cabinet at the time of the making of appointments in order to insure the best possible leadership.[1]

The committee also recommends that the preaching pastor relate himself to the major religious activities (such as Religious Emphasis Week, regular chapel services, special chapel programs when he is not the speaker, etc.) whenever possible and desirable. Also, according to the committee, the local pastor can make a significant contribution to the campus religious program (where the law allows it) by aiding in the annual organization of a class for the study of the Christian faith for those students who are not affiliated with the church, as well as for interested student-members.[2]

If the tree is known by its fruits, then the effectiveness of the ideal university parish pastor will be known by the results of his ministry to students. Some of the measuring rods of a successful university parish pastor's ministry to students will be affirmed by positive answers to the following questions: Do students respond to him? Are they attracted by his preaching, by his counseling, by the student program of his near-campus church? Is he prophetic as well as profound? Does his congregation worship? Does he have concern for great social causes? Does his church follow its students in seeking them out and offering to them an opportunity to grow in spiritual maturity and practical churchmanship? Is his home

---

[1] Religion in the Church College, p. 27.

[2] Ibid.

open to students in friendly invitation? Is he vitally interested in student Christian movements on the campus and can he cooperate with inter-faith ventures? Is he sensitive to his obligation to foreign students? Does he keep a fresh outlook and stay close to the source of high inspiration? Is the Campus-Church Relations Committee of his church (or the Board of Directors of the Wesley Foundation) functioning effectively? Does he cooperate with (or is he helping to organize) the Faculty Christian Fellowship? Does he share in the responsibility for developing a growing philosophy of student work among fellow members of the local community inter-church council?

If the university parish pastorate is a call of God to a specific ministry it would seem logical that the pastor involved would desire to seek some extra training and experience for this work. And, having achieved such training through some months of academic preparation and years of experience, it would appear reasonable that he might expect to continue for a term of years in serving such a pastorate. Ideally, he should serve at least ten years as a university parish pastor before developing optimum vocational aptitude.

If he prepared himself for his unique calling by special academic training, which will be outlined in the next section of this chapter, it would seem logical for him to expect some degree of "security" in the eyes of the appointive powers. Then, all things being considered under the system of appointment of traveling Methodist preachers, if and when a move became necessary, it would seem logical for him to be appointed to another university church.

If the university parish pastor were able to secure sufficient formal training and at least ten years of experience in the university community, it is conceivable that there ought to be an observable correlation between his training, the effectiveness of his student program, and the number of students affiliated with his church. This avenue of inquiry will be explored later.

B. Formal Training

Formal training of the university parish pastor should include a suitable degree of academic preparation, a grounding in theology and in the basic tenets of the Christian faith, a basic understanding of major social issues, familiarity with the principles of education, an understanding of the philosophy of student work as it relates to religion in higher education, and possibly a period of internship.

1. Academic Preparation

There is divergent opinion on the part of authorities in the field of religion in higher education as to the precise amount of formal training which the clergy needs to qualify for a university parish pastorate. But, in the main, it is generally agreed, "The needs of the day and of students insistently demand a thoroughness of preparation . . . such has never been required in any previous day."[1]

Some, like Christian Gauss, indicate that if college teachers of religion should be fully trained with the Ph. D. degree or its equivalent, then the pastor at the university church ought to have equal scholastic

---

[1]Clarence P. Shedd, "The University Pastor," Religion in Higher Education, ed. Milton Towner, (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1931), p. 314.

ranking.[1] But others agree that the equivalent of a good sound B.D. degree with special training in the area of religion in higher education is sufficient. Dr. C. P. Shedd says, in this regard:

> The university pastor must be as well trained for his job as the professors of the faculty at the near by university. College students want a "working religion" and will not go to a church or engage in church activities under the leadership of a man who does not measure up in ability, breadth of view, and human understanding with their professors.[2]

While Dr. Shedd feels that the theological education of a pastor at a university church should be obtained through the same type of discipline and scholarship as required in graduate schools for the Ph. D. degree, he feels that the doctorate is not necessary, but that a combination of the academic work involved in the best B.D. and M.A. degree requirements would come closest to meeting the vocational needs demanded by this profession.[3]

As far as the personal experience of the writer is concerned as observed in at least two university-parish pastorates, he would concur with the consensus that the parish preaching pastor at a university situation needs some extra academic training over and above that earned by the average Methodist pastor in pursuit of a B.D. degree. It is not important for the parish pastor to add additional letters to his name, but to do so might be an asset to gain status in the eyes of faculty members who attend his church, and who, themselves, are Doctors of Philosophy in their respective academic disciplines. These faculty members with doctor's degrees probably come a vast distance from ranking with their pastor in Biblical

---

[1] Ibid., p. 309.

[2] Shedd, The Church Follows Its Students, p. 245.

[3] Shedd, Religion in Higher Education, p. 314.

knowledge and religious education, but nevertheless they may exhibit a tendency to look down at him because he does not rank with them in scholarship. Bernard M. Loomer has this to offer in this regard:

> Even the university faculty people who are favorably disposed towards religion are in the main immature and uncritical about their religious faith. They are as naive and uncritical in this respect as they are critical and sophisticated in their own special studies. Their religious faith usually consists of that religious attitude and understanding which they have carried over from their childhood. Religion is for them something fundamental and simple, and they would prefer not to be forced to rethink their understanding of it.[1]

2. Grounding in Theology and Faith

There are specific areas of academic training which must be explored by the ideal university parish pastor. First, he must be well grounded in theology, probably with a major in this field. He needs to be able to communicate the eternal drama of the mutual relationship between the nature of God and the nature of man (and their search for one another) in contemporary language and in terms of a relevant theology that will give meaning and purpose to life.

He must know what he believes and whereon his faith is grounded. He must be able to undergird his beliefs with intelligent, intellectual and theological bases. He should know what his laymen think about the nature of God, man, Christ, immortality, sin, salvation, prayer, worship, the church, and the relation of organized religion to the state.

He must be familiar with the origin and growth of the living religions. He must be at home with the story of his own faith and be able to interpret the contributions made by the Judeo-Greeco-Roman world

---

[1] Bernard M. Loomer, "Religion and the Mind of the University," Liberal Learning and Religion, ed. Amos P. Wilder (New York: Harper and Bros., 1951), p. 148.

of Bible days to present day society. He should understand the impact which religion has made on the institutional patterns and thinking of our generation. He should know the role of religion in contemporary society, and, in the words of Christian Gauss, "the impact which it is NOT making."[1]

He should know his way around in the realm of Biblical criticism and what its significance can be for the present day individual who would grow in the Christian faith. He should be well grounded in philosophy and capable of making a religious interpretation of reality. He should be familiar with the great issues confronting contemporary religion in the thought-life of our generation. He should know about current philosophic trends of religion of the moment. He should know the meaning of neo-orthodoxy, liberalism, fundamentalism, sectarianism, humanism, naturalism, and the other "isms" of the day.

3. An Understanding of Social Issues

In this day of labels and libels, the preaching pastor at a university situation must know where he stands in regard to major social issues and the cataclysmic political forces which are reshaping cultures and re-making continents. He needs to make a thorough study of contemporary social issues in regard to their present day challenge to religion and religion in higher education. He will do well to give ear to Archbishop William Temple's admonition,

> The restoration of unity to man's experience depends mainly on securing at once the supremacy of religion among

---

[1]Christian Gauss, The Teaching of Religion in American Higher Education (New York: Ronald Press, 1951), p. 112.

> human interests, and the true spirituality of religion both in itself and in the mode of its supremacy.[1]

4. Familiarity With Educational Principles

It is important that the ideal university parish pastor have a minor in Religious Education in order that he might understand the educational process of learning both in the academic realm and how it functions in the lives of his parishioners. He needs to know the answers to the following questions. How does personality develop? How is character formed? How can persons be transformed through grace and Christian nurture? And how does divine encounter between God and man take place? These questions involve an area of formal education to which the university parish pastor is to address himself.

Courses in psychology and sociology will be invaluable if they are freighted with Christian application. Studies in counseling open up new avenues for ministering which until a few years ago were closed to the parish priest. The latter will be considered in some detail later in the dissertation.

In addition to such a program of formal training, the successful university parish pastor will become familiar with the history of religion in higher education and with the amazing story of the voluntary student Christian movements which have swept across the campuses of the world since the nineteenth century. The university parish pastor needs to know that higher education was born in the church and that the story of its evolution in this land is inherently interwoven with the march of American education

---

[1]Archbishop William Temple, Nature, Man and God (London: MacMillan and Company, 1934), p. 31.

across the years. He will hear the voice of Merrimon Cuninggim saying, "Religion brought forth our colleges and then yielded them to the secular spirit."[1]

5. The Philosophy of Student Work

He needs to become familiar with the emerging philosophy of student work, and to discover how Christian faculty members can learn to teach the courses of their respective departments with Christian perspective and with the knowledge that all of truth is of God. He should be no stranger to the particular contributions that have been made by his own denomination to religion in higher education, and he should take pride in his historical relationship to them.

In addition to his formal training at a theological seminary, it would be most helpful for the ideal university parish pastor to attend special summer courses in religion in higher education which are offered annually on the campuses of designated theological seminaries throughout the nation. These courses outline the technique of the Methodist Student Movement as practiced by professional student workers. They are designed not only for Wesley Foundation directors and full time professional laborers with students, but they are also "slanted" at the edification and inspiration of the university parish pastor in areas in which he is related to students.

Whether the preaching pastor at a university situation has the fortune to work in collaboration with a Wesley Foundation director or a professional student worker or not, he needs to know what the major issues

---

[1]Merrimon Cuninggim, The College Seeks Religion (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1947), p. 41.

of vital student work involve so that he can be sympathetic toward them. Even though his formal education may reach the doctoral level, his preparation for preaching at a university center is incomplete without graduation from such a course of instruction.

There is an impressive bibliography of books and relevant literature in the field of religion in higher education which is available for reading and study by the pastor who wishes to add to his knowledge concerning this significant area of his responsibility at the university parish. He also needs such organization of time and self-discipline that he will keep reading in all fields of this and other bibliography with sufficient selectivity in areas that are most relevant to his work.

There are a number of books, periodicals, and pamphlets which have been written recently in the area of Methodist student work with which the ideal university parish at a Methodist pulpit should become acquainted. The Department of College and University Religious Life of the Board of Education is very cooperative about making such a list of materials available. For example, the writer picked up five little books which are halpful to the pastor who relates to student life on a recent visit to the Methodist Publishing House at Nashville. They should be on the private bookshelf of every Methodist pastor. Four of these books are modest volumes titled: A Perspective on Methodist Higher Education, edited by Woodrow A. Geier;[1] Methodist Beginnings in Higher Education, by John O. Gross;[2] Methodism's Obsession with Higher Education, by Horace Greeley

---

[1]Woodrow A. Geier, ed., A Perspective on Methodist Higher Education (Nashville: Cokesbury Press, 1960).

[2]John O. Gross and Woodrow A. Geier, Methodist Beginnings in Higher Education (Nashville: the Board of Education of The Methodist Church, 1959).

Smith;[1] and The Student at Prayer, by H. D. Bollinger.[2] They merit a large circulation. Also, Bishop James C. Baker's The First Wesley Foundation[3]--which is the story of an adventure in Christian Higher Education--was dedicated to those who are interested in student work and in the cause of religion in higher education by the Methodist Council of Bishops and the Association of Wesley Foundations in 1960. The writer prophesies that this volume will become a classic in the library of Methodist "student-work" literature.

As another requirement, this pastor needs the stimulus of regular periods of discussion of basic intellectual issues with his peers. He also needs the stimulation that comes from writing either for such group meetings or for publication to clarify his own thinking and keep his mind alert.

6. A Period of Internship

In concluding this section on formal training requirements, a preparatory period of internship on the part of the university parish pastor is strongly recommended. Such an internship is demanded in most professions. If a period of supervised practice is necessary to practice surgery, to teach school, or to sell real estate, it would seem no less reasonable to require a period of internship under experienced guidance for the training of the ideal university parish pastor.

---

[1]Horace G. Smith, Methodism's Obsession With Higher Education (Nashville: The Board of Education of The Methodist Church, 1960).

[2]H. D. Bollinger, The Student at Prayer (Nashville: The Upper Room, 1960).

[3]James C. Baker, The First Wesley Foundation (Nashville: The Methodist Publishing House, 1960).

C. Some Additional Helps

In addition to acceptable general qualifications and a certain amount of formal training and experience, the ideal parish pastor at a near-campus church needs the collaboration of a complementing staff, a local church which is understandingly geared to the thought-structure and the experiences of the university community, and a sympathetic Bishop and Cabinet.

These additional helps which the ideal university parish pastor needs to perform his rightful functions in the university community are as essential to his ministry as his formal training and experience. Without them he cannot perform to the optimum of his ability. Let us review some of these additional aids briefly.

1. A Professional Student Worker

Ideally, the ministry of the university parish pastor should be supplemented by the services of an associate or assistant pastor, and/or a full time professional student worker who has been trained for his job.[1] In some cases an associate or an assistant might be qualified to supervise student work along with the performance of other duties, providing he had sufficient training. This is the practice followed in some smaller

---

[1]Professional and/or trained leaders of students on the staff of a university parish church hold a variety of titles (for example, Wesley Foundation Director, Associate Wesley Foundation Director, Associate Pastor, Assistant Pastor, Minister to Students, Minister of Youth, Campus Minister, Wesley Club Director, Wesley Fellowship Director, Student Worker, etc.). Also, some directors of student work are ordained and others are laymen. Some are full time workers and others are part time workers. Again, some are voluntary helpers. In search for a common name which will apply to the above, the writer has chosen to call this staff worker who ministers to students a "student worker." This designation will be used frequently throughout the dissertation.

churches that have a heavy responsibility for students but where salary is an important item and there are not sufficient duties to warrant engaging a second pastor for full time parish work. However, when a second pastor is employed to work in such a dual capacity it would be well for him to have a thorough job-analysis of his respective duties so that he, the senior pastor, the local church, the student group, and the Cabinet may have a definite understanding of what he is supposed to do.

Or a full time professional student worker could be employed to coordinate student religious activities. The student worker could be a dedicated layman. If the adjacent college or university were a state or independent school it would be helpful if the student worker, whether clergy or lay, had sufficient training and experience to be named the Foundation Director or the Associate Foundation Director. But when the senior pastor at a university situation has members on his staff who are acceptable youth-workers, it would seem reasonable to presume that he would be exercising poor judgment if he were to turn the whole business of student enterprise over to his assistants. It is important that he maintain a vital interest in campus affairs and student life. He has an obligation to give part of his time to student counseling and campus activities, and to minister to students. By the same token it is agreed that a pastor who is not willing to pay what it costs in hours and consecrated perseverance to retain a creative and growing edge in the direction of the college ought not to be appointed to a university situation.

Even though the student work in a university church may be vested in the capable hands of others, the department of student work is still

the responsibility of the pastor in charge. He continues to have an obligation to know about what is going on and he will want to keep his hand in. He would do well (with the full knowledge and consent of his staff) to retain some responsibility for student work so that he does not lose touch with what is going on in the student mind. Such a procedure would circumvent Leiffer's findings that when a preaching pastor in a university situation does not actually share some of the responsibility for student work there is a natural tendency on his part to lose contact with it.[1]

Of course the university parish pastor needs to exercise his prerogative in keeping his fingers on the pulse of student life with due caution so that his motives are not misunderstood by his staff. There is a fine line between the responsibilities of the staff and the responsibilities of the senior pastor which should not be overstepped under penalty of violation of the respective personalities involved. The pastor must not meddle nor work in contradiction to his aides. It would seem reasonable to conclude that when the pastor has a thorough understanding of his job-analysis, and when he has sufficient confidence in his staff, there would be a minimum of friction experienced at this point. This matter will be discussed further in a later chapter.

The important point to bring out at this juncture is that whether or not the university parish pastor has capable staff leadership for service to the university community, he will always have a relationship with students on his own. This is his solemn obligation which he cannot ignore.

---

[1]Leiffer, op. cit., p. 6.

2. A Capable Secretary

The university parish pastor needs to enlist the services of a dedicated secretary who works at her job with a consecrated sense of vocation. The right kind of a secretarial staff at a university parish church can enhance the ministry of both the pastor and the church as they relate to students. Such a secretary needs not only to be proficient in business and public relations, but also she needs to be grounded in the philosophy of student work and have some training in later-adolescent student psychology. She needs to be a good listener and a "mother-confessor." She needs a sixth sense to know when to refer student enquiry directly to the pastor, and when to delay or defer it.

3. A Cooperative Staff and Cabinet

It is agreed that both the administrative staff as well as the laymen at the near-campus church need to be equipped with an appreciation of the student mind, a willingness to bend a sympathetic ear, and a determination to go more than half way in cooperating with the goals originally established by the Quadrennial Commission on Christian Higher Education for enhancing the cause of Christ among the students on the campus. These are minimum standards, and a relationship that fails to measure up to them is unfortunate. More will be said later about how a desired spirit of rapport between the local parish church and the university community is developed and maintained.[1]

And a pastor who is appointed to the gargantuan task at a university parish post must have the sympathetic, fraternal, and Christlike understanding of his Bishop and Cabinet, as well as the one hundred per

---

[1]Below, p. 385.

cent backing of his Conference Board of Education.

These are the minimum additional helps needed by the university parish pastor as he labors at his job. If the pastor at such a station finds that he has insufficient professional assistance, and/or a congregation which is antipathetic to students, and/or an unsympathetic attitude on the part of the Cabinet, and/or a breakdown in essential cooperation with the Conference Board of Education--then he must be qualified in heavenly wisdom, "yankee ingenuity," and the mind of Christ to train his additional helps as best he can. He must keep building out of what resources he has at hand, until he is suitably equipped with tools for his task.

D. Summary

In projecting the qualification for the prototype of an ideal university parish pastor, the writer first outlined some general qualifications which included personal, spiritual and inspirational insight, as well as suitable scholastic ability and experience. Then he expounded on the need for formal training in the following areas: qualified and disciplined scholarship, a suitable degree of academic preparation, a thorough grounding in theology and in the tenets of the Christian faith, a vital Christian experience, the ability to communicate the Christian gospel in relevant terms, an understanding of the principles of education, a thorough understanding of the philosophy of student work, familiarity with the place of religion in higher education and an acquaintance with the large library of literature available in that area, and a possible period of internship.

Under "additional helps" the following items were covered: need for a qualified staff and an intelligent working-relationship with the staff, plus a sympathetic and cooperative attitude on the part of the local church, the Cabinet and the Conference Board of Education.

It is time now to take a look at the specific functions of the university parish pastor which are peculiar to his ministry to students. This assignment, which will conclude the background phase of the dissertation, will be treated in the following chapter.

CHAPTER VI

THE IDEAL UNIVERSITY PARISH PASTOR: FUNCTIONS

In addition to the acceptable qualifications which were outlined in the preceding chapter, the ideal university parish pastor needs to be equipped for fulfilling the particular functions of his ministry through which he relates to students. This chapter will deal with a projection of the qualifications of such a pastor in the area of these special functions. It will not be concerned with all of the routine functions of the pastor which relate to the normal congregation in the common setting. For example, it will not cover the administering of the sacraments, funerals or weddings, visiting from house to house among the constituent membership, or the administrative details and disciplines of the pastor's ministry as they relate to the needs of his regular congregation.

The above are essential parts of the pastor's work which cannot be ignored. It is impossible to contemplate the total ministry of any pastor without reference to them. The writer agrees that serving the needs of students represents only a fraction of the ministry of the university parish pastor to his local church and to the larger university community.

However, since the scope of this dissertation was necessarily limited in the beginning to a study of the functions of the preaching pastor at a college or university church as they relate to student life, this chapter will be concerned primarily with the projection of the

special functions of the ideal pastor as he relates to students. Let us now turn to a consideration of these functions.

A. Primary Specific Functions

At a university parish the preaching pastor performs important primary ministerial functions through which he relates to students in a different way than he relates to his regular constituents. These peculiar functions relate to the university community in a manner which is not matched in any comparable kind of group living. These functions are five in number, and this study will be limited to their consideration. They are: preaching, counseling, teaching, evangelism, and administration.

With the exception of the first (preaching) and possibly the second (counseling), there is little significance attached to the order in which these functions are listed for study. The important thing is that all of them will be treated as integral and related parts of the whole study. In limiting this study to a consideration of these five functions, the writer is again reminded that it is impossible arbitrarily to divide the ministry of any pastor into a prescribed number of neatly labeled parcels. It would be impossible to package these parcels into isolated and unrelated units.

That there is a natural blending of the five functions selected for observation in this study cannot be denied. Who can say, for example, where a pastor's preaching ends and his teaching begins? Who can discern a clear line of cleavage between evangelism and counseling? Or who would insist that a pastor's administrative function is not integrally intertwined with all the functions of his ministry? According to

dictionary definition the word "function" in its mathematical connotation means, "a quantity whose value depends upon the values of other quantities."[1]

Therefore, if it appears that this study dismembers the ministry of the university parish pastor into autonomous segments, this has been done deliberately so that each segment may be "mounted on a slide under the microscope" for careful observation. Such observation requires exacting examination of separate cross-sections of data. But in the process of this specialized scrutiny, the reader must remember that the individual samples selected for vivisection come from the same body. Hands, feet, ears, and hair have different functions, but they are all parts of one body. They are all essential to the functioning of the total physical being. Whenever one "specimen" is observed, the findings must always be considered in relation to the other "specimens" and to the parent body as a whole.

And, pressing the analogy further, when the five selected functions of the university parish pastor are subjected to critical scrutiny, one must not forget that there are other vital organs of the pastoral "body" which must go on functioning in a related way--even though they may be taken for granted during specialized surveillance.

Tradition demands that preaching be placed first among the five functions of the university parish pastor that have been selected for observation in this study, because of the primary place which this function of the Methodist pastor has enjoyed since the days of our Wesleyan

---

[1] The American Every Day Dictionary, ed. Jess Stein (New York: Random House, 1953), p. 184.

founders.[1] Because of the unique problems of the student mind, which generally are associated with the problems of adolescence and early young-adulthood, it would seem that a parish pastor's next open avenue of service to students would be through his counseling ministry. The next two functions (teaching and evangelism) are both significant ones, but, since the stage for the drama of this study has a university setting, the teaching function will receive prior consideration. Evangelism also plays an historic role in the parish pastor's relationship with the university community. Therefore, evangelism is the fourth function of the university parish pastor which will be considered. The final function, administration, is a general category no less important than the preceding four categories, but it is necessarily of a different nature. It serves as a kind of a "catch-all" for cataloguing necessary administrative details which are part of the pastor's job at the university church.

The writer will now consider these five functions and attempt to project the qualifications of the ideal university parish pastor as they relate to the functions.

---

[1]It must be pointed out here that the preaching function should rightfully be included under a more comprehensive heading; namely, "conducting worship." But preaching is a chief characteristic of leading in worship that can be readily observed for the purpose of comparing and contrasting behaviour. Also, because of the central place which the pulpit has occupied in Methodist tradition, in the minds of many Methodist laymen preaching has become the most important part of the worship service. For these reasons, therefore, and because it is necessary to limit the scope of the dissertation, the first observable function of the university parish pastor will be designated simply as the preaching function. This designation is used by the writer with the understanding that normally the concept of "preaching" cannot be enlarged to cover the total conduct of worship.

1. Preaching

The first function through which the university parish pastor can serve students is the function of preaching. The preaching pastor must be equipped with a good mind, a well grounded education, deep convictions, strong religious insights, an assured Christian experience, and a positive approach to life. He ought to know how to conduct worship and he ought to be a good preacher. He need not be a great preacher so much as he needs to possess a warm friendliness and be approachable. In order to preach in a manner that is relevant to the needs of students and the university community he must be precise at the point of the intellectual process.

The number of students who come to worship at the near-campus church on any given Sunday morning may vary according to the quality and the relevance of the message. The number may vary according to the "proximity of the church, its type of service, and the spirit of friendliness on the part of the congregation.[1] There will always be a group of religious students who feel loyal to denominational patterns established in their youth and who will seek out the church of their preference for worship. These and other students will be among the most responsive listeners in the congregation on Sunday morning. The university parish pastor has an obligation to minister effectively to these students through the medium of preaching.

Preaching to this group with the expectation of divine-encounter, decision, and commitment requires peculiar training, as has been stated. If the preacher at a college post is to attract people of the university

---

[1]James A. Moore, "The University Pastor," Religion in Higher Education, ed. Milton Towner (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1931), p. 189.

community into his sanctuary for worship he must know how to communicate the truths of God in a language which they can understand. Bishop T. Otto Nall, formerly the editor of The Christian Advocate, advises a preacher at a university center that he might as well stay at home if he fails to communicate intelligently with his hearers. He says in counsel to him:

> Remember that religious truth is wanted--therefore the truth should be presented in a concise, vivid, interesting, catching, experience-sharing form, and unless he contacts his hearers in the language they can understand he will not get far, no matter how learned or pious he is.[1]

In order to communicate the Christian faith, the ideal university parish pastor needs, among other things, to have: (1) a knowledge of the nature of religious experience, (2) a solid theological foundation for his communicative effort, and (3) a technique of rephrasing theological language so that it is relevant to modern man's experience in a contemporary world. He needs to know how individuals feel when they are confronted with the fact of God and commit themselves to God through a new personal relationship. He needs to know how men have found God in the past and how God reveals himself today in human experience. He needs to know that divine-encounter is based on the fundamental fact that God is always addressing man and that this experience is reciprocal. It is initiated by God, but there must be a free acceptance of it by the human spirit.[2] Through his preaching he will endeavor to communicate the basic fundamentals of the Christian faith so that divine-human encounter is facilitated in the lives of students.

---

[1] T. Otto Nall, "On the Record," The Christian Advocate, June 7, 1956, p. 13.

[2] Georgia E. Harkness, The Resources of Religion (New York: Henry Holt and Company, 1936), p. 143.

He also needs a solid theological foundation for his communicative effort in order that a correct perspective of what Randolph C. Miller calls "the-truth-about-God-in-relation-to-man"[1] may be transmitted to his listeners. Since theology is "the study of the self-revelation of the living God,"[2] and hence the source of our knowledge of what God has done and is doing for man, it provides guidance for the formation of man's faith and stands at the center of the process of Christian growth.[3] It is imperative that the pastor shall have a clear idea about the nature of God, man, sin, salvation, Jesus Christ, the Holy Spirit, the Church, the kingdom of God--and their relation to one another--as well as to God's total plan for an expanding universe. He needs to be clear in his mind about such subjects as the problem of evil, revelation, incarnation, prayer, and immortality.

The ideal pastor would implement appreciably his ability to communicate the Christian faith if he could rephrase his theology in terms relevant to the understanding of his present day congregation. This is what Miller calls the rediscovery of a relevant theology which will bridge the gap between content and method.[4] Communication of the faith has always been difficult because of the language barrier. In this regard the ideal pastor might well study the techniques of successful contemporary preachers. He will do well to read Tillich, Sockman, and McCracken

---

[1] Randolph C. Miller, Education for Christian Living (Englewood Cliff: Prentice Hall Company, 1956), p. 60.

[2] Moberly, op. cit., p. 282.

[3] Miller, loc. cit.

[4] Ibid., p. 36.

widely, as they are probably doing as much as any of today's theologians to find correlative theological answers to the needs of this generation and make them available for the use of the lay mind. In his attempt to make this transition in method of communication, however, he should be warned to avoid two common errors: (1) being "cheap" and undignified in his language or illustrations, and/or (2) trying to be "highbrow," as he would if he endeavored to imitate Tillich.

In order that the ideal pastor's theology may be geared with proper relation to the general objectives of the Methodist Student Movement, he should make the theological affirmation of the philosophy of college and university religious work of The Methodist Church his own. This affirmation is so important that it is quoted in entirety at this juncture:

> The basis of a philosophy of the college and university religious movement of the Methodist Church is the affirmation:
>
> That God is creator and sustainer of life, whose purpose orders nature and the universe, whose will is fulfilled in law and love. He is the Father of mankind, having imparted to man his own spirit to be fulfilled in worship, obedience and self-sacrificing service in his kingdom;
>
> That Jesus Christ is Son of God and Son of Man through whom the Father's unfailing grace and redeeming love are mediated in time--past, present, and future;
>
> That the Holy Spirit is the personal presence of God in our lives, who wills to reconcile man to himself, acting in history, creating, judging, and redeeming as proclaimed by the scriptures and affirmed in the fellowship of the Church;
>
> That the Church is the body of Christ, that where two or three are gathered in His name, there is the Church in essence.[1]

---

[1] The Philosophy of Methodist College and University Religious Work, p. 5. Cited hereafter as Philosophy of Methodist Student Work.

The writer does not intend to make this dissertation a primer for preaching, but he suggests that the preaching pastor at a university post direct much of his preaching towards life. There might be some debate about how much he ought to slant his sermons deliberately at student life and student problems (to the exclusion of the remainder of the congregation), but his preaching should communicate to students that he is conscious of their problems and that he is earnestly speaking to their needs. He might find value in seasonal or "block preaching," when he can focus attention on periods when students are more apt to be present than not. This will be explained in a later chapter. He should receive criticism of his sermons offered by students appreciatively, and from time to time his pulpit should be open to visiting pulpit guests of recognized preaching ability.

Despite the press of multitudinous details which demand the attention of his dual ministry, the ideal university parish pastor will beware of becoming "hamstrung" with administrative minutia so that he finds it impossible to be creative in his reading and study program. He should be warned by Leiffer who observes:

> A repeated complaint of faculty and students is that the minister of the near-campus church cannot preach well, and therefore does not reach effectively either faculty or students.
>
> The willingness of a minister to continue his study habits and to work diligently at sermon preparation should be an important criterion in selecting the senior pastor for a near-campus church.[1]

2. Counseling

A second function whereby the ideal university parish pastor

---

[1] Leiffer, op. cit., p. 102.

can be of service to students is the function of counseling. Counseling is a difficult and challenging role, and it is performed rather poorly by the average pastor in a college situation as attested by Leiffer's findings in a study of twenty-eight colleges and universities in three western states. He observed that students at most campuses rated personal counseling as the weakest part of the student program, and adds this comment:

> Pastors and leaders should be urged to secure training in counseling methods. They should make themselves available to students by announcing office hours and also by doing personal calling among the students.[1]

Preaching may seem more important than counseling to the average layman who has rarely availed himself of the counseling service of a pastor trained in this area. The typical college student, however, is an unfolding later-adolescent who rebels against an exclusive diet of preaching. To him it represents a form of authoritarianism which he sought to escape when he broke the bondage of his childhood home and the "preaching" of dominating parents. He has been told what to do all his life, and he is at the age when he wants to try his own wings of authority and tell somebody else what to do.

Because rebellion is a dominant mood of later adolescence, student members of a university church will often feel a desire to challenge the pulpit claims of the preaching pastor. But there is no opportunity offered for question or debate during the Sunday morning worship hour. In order to provide an opportunity for intellectual and spiritual catharsis on the part of the student listener, the preaching pastor must make himself available for private conferences with individual students. In this

---

[1] Ibid., p. 104.

regard the writer concurs with Cecil F. Ristow who states that students must know that their pastor will respect their dissenting arguments which may appear distressingly shocking on the surface, but which, in reality, merely furnish a smoke-screen camouflaging deeper anxieties. Ristow says,

> He [the university parish pastor] must bring to this aspect of his work sincere respect and affection for persons, understanding of the situation in which the student finds himself, and patience that remembers that the student has not had his years of experience upon which to base his answers to life's problems.[1]

Students have problems. Frequently these problems are sharper than the layman would suspect. The student is entering upon the threshold of adulthood. He is experiencing a time in his life when many of the great issues of the cosmos appear to be at stake. God, Vocation, Marriage, Success, Status, Acceptability, Exams, and "Who-am-I?" are spelled with capital letters. Despite the commonly accepted concept that college days are carefree and that every one on the campus is happy because he's having a wonderful time, Dr. Melvin L. Selzer, psychiatrist at the University of Michigan's mental hygiene clinic, reports that a high percentage of students are psychoneurotic, suffering from severe emotional combinations of anxiety, compulsions, phobias, obsessions, and a tendency to shift mental conflicts to organic areas.[2]

This point of view is shared by Waldo Beach who, in an interpretation of Christian ethics for the contemporary campus titled

---

[1]Cecil F. Ristow, "The University Church as a Worshipping Fellowship," Campus Evangelism in Theory and Practice, ed. Richard N. Bender (Nashville: National Methodist Student Movement, the Board of Education of The Methodist Church, 1957), p. 102.

[2]San Jose Mercury-News, February 14, 1960, p. 32. Reported by the Associated Press.

Conscience on Campus, says, "College students are beset by anxieties and deep confusions."[1] He denies a popular assumption that college is a carefree time "replete with football rallies in the fall and panty raids in the spring," where everybody is "young, happy and on the way to a dance," with a much more realistic picture of what college is really like as observed from the point of view of one who is inside the campus. He adds:

> The gay calm of campus greetings often hides a grim desperation. It is the alumni, not the students, who talk about college students "without a care in the world." They do not see the pre-exam panic, and the postromance desolation. They do not notice the girl who dropped out because she was not pledged to the right sorority, or the basketball star shipped because he was caught stealing a copy of the economics final. They forget the gnawing insecurity, the spiritual smog that hangs over the dormitory on a Sunday afternoon, the lostness, the aimlessness, and the frustrations of the academic run-around.[2]

The student's anxieties are deep and his problems are unique. He needs the friendly guidance of a pastor who has some special training in student-counseling, the kind that utilizes the insights of depth psychology. Untold richness of new experience is taking place where religion and psychiatry and psychotherapy work together in achieving fullness of life.

Preaching alone cannot solve the anxieties of students. A number of students will be attracted to a university parish church through loyalty to childhood Christian training, and the resultant experience of worship and fellowship which they encounter there may be of great worth to them. But unless students are given the opportunity to verbalize their problems in the presence of an accepting and understanding counselor, who, through

---

[1] Waldo Beach, Conscience on Campus (New York: Association Press, 1958), p. 19.

[2] Ibid.

a process of patient and indirect suggestion, attempts to help them face up to their difficulties and to discover solutions for themselves in which they can perform and complete the active role, they may not grow in maturity. Therefore, the transforming power of Christ may never become available to them.

Because the solution of many problems of student life depends upon interpersonal relations which involve two-way verbalizing (counseling involves dialogue and preaching involves monologue), the ideal university parish pastor needs to be grounded in methods of counseling that call for more than sermonettes tied up in neat packages for the counselee to carry back to the dormitory in a brief case.

A pastor's training and ability in the art of counseling should be among his first qualifications to warrant assignment to a university parish pastorate. The need of university students for counseling by an adequately trained pastor is so acute that Bishops, committees and boards who make such appointments at near-campus churches should not only make sure of the acceptable qualities of their appointees as preachers and administrators, but they should also make diligent inquiry into their training as counselors. Unless students feel that they have a "relationship of involvement" with the university parish pastor which does more than preach to their needs, they will not be attracted to the leadership of a man who is unwilling or unqualified to engage in such interpersonal relationships which they can often find in a sympathetic professor on the campus.

In a symposium titled The Best of Pastoral Psychology, Harry Emerson Fosdick describes the necessary relationship between preaching and

counseling as a "two-way street."[1] He indicates that preaching is counseling on a group scale. He points out that any preacher who speaks to the real needs of his people is bound to be sought out by individuals seeking his intimate counsel. He says that the right kind of preaching forces the pastor to become a personal counselor and adds, "One of the best tests of a sermon is the number of people who afterward wish to see the preacher alone."[2] The right kind of sermons delivered from the university parish pulpit elicit natural desires on the part of student listeners to talk with the pastor about problems which are disturbing them. If the way were open and if the minister were available, it seems logical to assume that students would be drawn to him for personal counseling. The correlation between preaching and counseling at university centers across Methodism will be investigated later in this study.

This study cannot include a detailed treatise on the technique and method of counseling. Nevertheless, the ideal university parish pastor must understand the goals and the methods of counseling as they relate to students. He must know that the aim of counseling, simply stated, is "to help people help themselves."[3] He needs to know Outler's definition of the counseling situation in Christian context as related to students; namely, as consisting of two persons, both of whom are concerned to solve or improve a problem which is, for some reason or other, out of balance

---

[1]Harry Emerson Fosdick, "Personal Counseling and Preaching," The Best of Pastoral Psychology, ed. Simon Doniger (Great Neck: Pastoral Psychology Press, 1952), p. 115.

[2]Ibid., p. 123.

[3]Comment by Professor Robert C. Leslie in class in Pastoral Counseling at the Pacific School of Religion, Berkeley, California.

or control.[1] It is important that he knows about the various methods of counseling which are available to him, and he needs to have a working knowledge of the clinical steps by which Christian counseling proceeds.

The ideal university parish pastor who is trained in counseling will understand that later-adolescents are in a constant state of searching for maturity through which they may find satisfaction for themselves, and through which they may discover acceptable places in society as suitable persons. There is a natural tendency for students to become thwarted in this search for maturity. When such a blocking takes place the human personality fails to grow from hostility toward acceptance, from inadequacy toward adequacy, and from immaturity toward maturity. To release this mental blocking and aid the subject to continue his growth toward maturity, personal counseling, with its therapeutic use of psychological, psychiatric, and/or group dynamics principles, has proved exceedingly helpful.

The ideal counselor at a university church needs to know what kind of problems cause college students to become anxious. He needs to know that these problems involve the following areas as listed by Palmer Garver: educational, vocational, emotional, social, discipline, and health.[2] He should also be familiar with the view of C. Eugene Morris, who says that a counselor of youth needs to be able to recognize the

---

[1]Albert C. Outler, A Christian Context for Counseling, Hazen Pamphlet number 18, published by the Edward W. Hazen Foundation, New Haven, Conn., p. 4.

[2]Palmer Garver, "A Study of Counselors in Selected Industrial Educational, and Social Service Organizations," unpublished Ph. D. dissertation, Northwestern University, quoted in Shirley A. Hamrin and Blanche B. Paulson, Counseling Adolescents (Chicago: Science Research Associates, Inc., 1950), p. 228.

following areas of needs in the lives of students who seek his help: physical needs, needs for self-realization, creativity, experience-sharing, personal recognition, status, learning to live with authority, sense of achievement, and personal commitment.[1] A note of warning should be sounded against accepting the order of this listing as fixed, complete, and without considerable overlapping. Moral, spiritual, and religious problems must be added. And (as will be demonstrated later) there is such an overlapping of these problems that it would be wise to view them as a kind of a constellation, in which each star shines with a different magnitude, yet all are observed.

If the university pastor would be an ideal servant of students he should be able to distinguish the earmarks of emotional disturbance that are characteristic of later-adolescent life such as English and Pearson tabulate.[2] He should become familiar with Harry S. Sullivan's ten outstanding diagnostic syndromes, any one of which may show up in the series of interpersonal relations through which the adolescent passes on his journey from childhood to adult maturity.[3] The alert counselor of students will be able to spot these syndromes as indications of mental disorder which need attention.

In no sense does this study suggest that the university parish pastor should become a practicing psychologist or a psychotherapist

---

[1] Eugene Morris, Counseling With Young People (New York: Association Press, 1954), pp. 10-13.

[2] O. Spurgeon English and Gerald H. Pearson, Emotional Problems of Living (New York: W. W. Norton, Inc., 1945), pp. 163-292.

[3] Harry Stack Sullivan, Conceptions of Modern Psychiatry (New York: W. W. Norton, Inc., 1940), pp. 86 ff.

(unless he has had clinical training in this area and is properly licensed), but he ought to be able to make elementary diagnoses of the needs of his counselees so that he can refer cases needing professional care. And he ought to know enough about elementary depth-counseling to be able to employ its methods correctly with clients who do not need professional referral.

The ideal pastor will set up a schedule of hours reserved for counseling and publish the periods of his availability. He might hang a notebook on his office door in which students can schedule their own appointments. He will also contact students personally, as well as visit them as a matter of routine when they are confined to the college infirmary and local hospitals. Although much of his counseling will be done in his office on appointment, he will constantly be on the alert for the possibility of creating new counseling situations through his personal relations with students and their doings both in his church and on the campus.

Pastoral counseling is time consuming, and no matter how proficient the ideal parish pastor may be in his exercise of this function, he cannot do all that is required. He needs help, and frequently the only help he can secure he must train from the ranks. In this regard he needs to heed the counsel of Cecil Ristow, who says that members of the congregation need to be enlisted to share the counseling task.[1]

Ristow suggests that most university church congregations have a number of mature Christians who would be qualified or who could be trained to become acceptable lay-counselors of students. He points out that there are usually some alumni around who have not forgotten their

---

[1]Ristow, loc. cit.

student days, and that there will be members of the university faculty who could serve in this capacity, "since their simultaneous membership in the church and in the academic community will bear eloquent witness to their convictions that the same person can be at the same time both a Christian and a scholar."[1] This type of trained voluntary help for aid in student counseling will be found valuable in situations where the pastor has no staff or professional student worker.

A concluding word about this qualification of the ideal university parish pastor is in order. Because of the newness of this important function, and because of the uncharted seas in this area which remain to be explored, the pastor at a student center may be tempted to concentrate on this function of his ministry to the exclusion of his other responsibilities to students. For example, he must be aware of the temptation to spend too much time in counseling students who have problems similar to his own (like the physician who specializes in the treatment of a disease from which he suffers). He must beware of an unconscious attempt to "use" the problems of students to solve his own unresolved spiritual or psychological needs. He must learn to refer quickly those students who are beyond the limited reach of his therapeutic skill, instead of being "challenged" to waste their time and his. He must discover how to discern between a genuine need for counseling and an exhibition of egocentricity which ought not to be encouraged. This matter will be discussed in a later chapter.

3. Teaching

A third important function through which the ideal university

---

[1] Ibid.

parish pastor ministers to students is the function of teaching. This teaching may be either formal or informal. It embraces a multitude of ramifications. It can be performed as the pastor preaches. It can take place in organized classes in his church, in the college or university as he teaches an accredited course in the department of religion, or as he supervises a non-credit course at the invitation of a group of students. And the local parish pastor can be an effective teacher of religion in his daily vocation as he moves about the campus and the university parish.

A limited number of pastors teach classes in religion for academic credit or for some form of recognition. In smaller church-related colleges the local Methodist pastor, if academically qualified, is sometimes asked to teach a course in Bible, comparative religions, or philosophy. At some state and independent schools, when the law permits, he may be extended the opportunity to teach on the campus in connection with a department of religion or a school of religion.

Separate departments of religion have been included in the regular curricula of many state and independent schools. These departments are responsible for the employment of more and more full time faculty personnel to teach religion. Thus, the opportunity for formal classroom teaching of religion on the part of the local parish pastor appears to be diminishing. Nevertheless, if the local pastor were qualified, the opportunity might open for him to teach occasional Bible classes or courses in religion at any number of schools where heretofore such courses had not been offered.

The ideal parish pastor should limit his formal teaching to one class per semester and perhaps skip an occasional term. This should be

the pattern especially for the local pastor who has no professional assistant or student worker to help him carry the full load of his near-campus church responsibilities. Qualified observers point out that if he accepts too much responsibility for teaching he ceases to be a parish pastor and tends to become a college professor. Dr. Shedd comments here:

> While in certain institutions for economy or other reasons these functions must be combined, experience nevertheless shows that in the long run the pastoral or the teaching function suffers.[1]

Since the university mind is accustomed to the use of logic and the scientific processes of academic teaching, it is important that the ideal university parish pastor be familiar with the teaching method of higher education. A Methodist pastor ought to be qualified by seminary training for a general teaching ministry wherever he is appointed, but this arm of his training must be especially extended at a university center where the achievement of maturity and integrated personality is brought about by guided growth.

The teaching opportunities of the university parish pastor are somewhat identical to the teaching opportunities enjoyed by Christian faculty members who labor at church-related colleges. In this regard Dr. Frank Lankard, former Dean of Baldwin-Wallace college, says that the teacher in a Christian college will attempt to do four things:

> First, the teacher must add to his competency in his own field in understanding of religious values . . . (secondly) If he possesses a consuming ideal, coupled with the ability to lead his students into the spirit of high adventure, he will have little difficulty in developing those qualities which are essential if tomorrow is to be better than today . . . (thirdly) The teacher has a responsibility to the world of values within which the student lies . . . and (finally) he is charged with the responsibility of grappling with

---

[1] Shedd, The Church Follows Its Students, p. 259.

> the perplexities of students, stripping down such problems to bed rock of human need without fear or favor.[1]

If the local pastor at a near-campus church will incorporate Dr. Lankard's instruments of the Christian teaching method into his ministry and cooperate with other bona fide Christian agencies on the campus which are seeking to establish a community of Christians, together they will be able to present a concept of religion which satisfies intellectually, challenges morally, and which will contribute to the enrichment of the university community.

The ideal pastor may have more opportunity to do informal than formal teaching. Whether or not he is called to teach a scheduled class of religion on the campus, he will be teaching religion every day by the way he acts and by the way he interprets the sacred heritage of Christian philosophy in his dealing with people. Often the best teaching the local pastor does will be through the informal educational setting of discussion groups, committee meetings, casual counseling, inter-personal relationships, student programs and activities which are completely divorced from the disciplines of formal teaching. In this regard a prominent observer says that the university pastor, through his informal teaching and counseling program, may create for students and the university mind an educational setting that is as packed with opportunity for learning as that of the college classroom.[2]

The training of the ideal university parish pastor will not be complete until he becomes acquainted with the dynamics of general education. As has been stated, he should be well grounded in facts concerning

---

[1] Frank Glenn Lankard, "Who is the Christian Teacher?" The Christian Advocate, September 13, 1956, p. 7.

[2] Shedd, op. cit., p. 260.

the general educational process, the laws of thinking, and how learning takes place. He should also be able to relate the gains of public progressive education to the plan of Christian education which has been evolved in his own church expressly for the purpose of transforming persons in Christ and aiding them to grow in Christian nurture.

He should be familiar with "the crisis at the university" and with the dilemma of higher education as outlined in Chapter II of this study. And he needs to have a sympathetic attitude toward the growing philosophy that religion can be the key which opens many doors on the campus when it is placed at the heart of the curricular process. He should be a zealous devotee of the new and spreading gospel in university circles--that religion stands at the heart of the university ready to challenge and to reorient all of its disciplines of knowledge to the center of Being, which is God himself. He should know about the growing disposition of many college administrators to look with friendly eye upon employing teachers who are grounded in the Christian faith and who know how to interpret their respective disciplines with religious perspective. He will be preaching to some of these faculty members on Sunday morning.

In this regard he ought to have full knowledge of the Faculty Christian Fellowship and how that organization strives to develop a definable community of Christian concern in the academic world through the organization of Christian faculty members whose concern in the relation of Christian faith to the vocations and disciplines of the teacher and scholar.[1] Where such a fellowship does not exist he may be instrumental

---

[1] The Faculty Christian Fellowship, a pamphlet issued by the Faculty Christian Fellowship, 257 Fourth Avenue, New York 10, N.Y.

in planning its organization or in helpfully cooperating with its program when it is formed. He should be a subscriber to The Christian Scholar[1] which is the official publication of that body. In this connection he should be appraised of the substantial contributions being made by the Hazen, Danforth, and other foundations which contribute substantial sums of money dedicated to the specialized training of teachers on behalf of the Faculty Christian Movement.

The Methodist pastor who labors near the campus of a state or tax-supported school needs to make a thorough study of any restrictions or limitations which have been placed on the administration of the local college or university in regard to the teaching of religion or religious guidance on the campus. He would add much to his personal store of knowledge, and he would contribute a valuable service to higher education in his state if he would make a personal study of the traditions, charters, and/or legal statutes which appear, either actually or assumedly, to uphold such a severe concept of the separation of church and state that a relaxed attitude toward the teaching of religion is impossible. When the facts are known he will discover that Americans have far more liberty and freedom than they surmise in regard to what may or may not be taught or provided in the form of religion or religious guidance of students at tax-supported schools--and far more than they ever use. He will discover that in no state can nothing at all be done, and he will discover that no one has ever found nationwide wholesale legal or constitutional provisions which prevent college or universities from including

---

[1] The Christian Scholar, published quarterly by the Commission on Christian Higher Education of the National Council of Churches, 257 Fourth Avenue, New York, N. Y.

religion in their curricula and/or programs if they so desire.[1] It is also a matter of record that no dispute over church-state relations as regarding the teaching of religion or the assuming of responsibility for the religious life of students of tax-supported schools of higher learning has ever been carried up to the Supreme Court. It is agreed that most disputes of this nature center in elementary and secondary schools.

He should know all about the struggle of students (as reflected in Chapter III) on the contemporary educational scene to discover an adequate philosophy that gives life meaning. He should share with them in their search for this new philosophy which insists, according to Palmer Garver, that they want ". . . a belief in something stronger and more important than themselves, for without such a faith life lacks meaning and the individual is somehow incomplete."[2] He will be sadly remiss in preparation for his task if he does not know in detail the fabulous story (recounted in Chapter IV) about what The Methodist Church and the Board of Education have done to follow their students to the college campus--and precisely where he fits into that picture of religion in higher education.

It is to be presumed that there might be measurable correlation between the number of students reached in the Methodist program by the local pastor who teaches courses in religion for credit as compared to the number of students enlisted in the near-campus church program of the pastor who does not teach. This problems will be posed for consideration in a later chapter.

---

[1] Merrimon Cuninggim, The College Seeks Religion (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1947), p. 192.

[2] Hamrin and Paulson, Counseling Adolescents, p. 87.

4. Evangelism

A fourth significant function through which the ideal university parish pastor may minister to students is the function of evangelism. In an earlier chapter it was noted how there is a growing desire on the part of the student mind to discover meaning in life. This is a sympton of the "lostness" of many American students who have been alienated from meaningful relationship to God. This lostness, according to Charles S. McCoy, is the most severe disturbance which persons can experience and indicates ". . . the lack of a firm center of meaning or any certain point of orientation."[1] He adds:

> God in Christ comes as a physician to this disease from which all of us must be saved . . . we need a reconciliation with ourselves, with others, and with God. . . . Through Him (Jesus) man may be saved from his lostness and find reconciliation with God, self, and neighbor.[2]

The communication of this message of God in Christ to the student is the stuff of campus evangelism, and the Methodist Student Movement (with all of its agents and organizations) is committed to aid in the communication of this important message to the university community. The stated objectives of the Methodist Student Movement are committed to the leading of all members of the university to an acceptance of the Christian faith, to witnessing on the campus to the mission and message of the Church, and to witnessing to the truth of the Christian gospel and thus to winning the campus community to Christ.[3] If these objectives are

---

[1] Charles S. McCoy and Neely D. McCarter, The Gospel on Campus (Richmond: John Knox Press, 1959), p. 35.

[2] Ibid.

[3] Philosophy of Methodist Student Work, pp. 7-14.

in order, the university parish pastor as a participant in the Methodist Student Movement is destined to play a key role in campus evangelism.

Through the example provided by Jesus Christ who is the head of the Church, the body of Christ is called to minister to the faithful and to seek and redeem the lost wherever they may be found. It is basic to Methodism that her pastors and laymen seek out and witness to those who need her ministry, rather than wait (as do some other denominations and sects) for them to seek out the Church. The modern college community, which is often a secular community, in many ways constitutes a fertile field for the Church's ministry in this respect.[1] The student must be sought until he is found. And through an intelligent and planned program of persuasion, invitation, example, and reasonable appeal to intellect and heart which does not violate his integrity or his right to say "No," he must be "found." His life must be challenged and changed until he is born into the body of Christ within which he finds new life and a newly integrated nature. There is a definite sense of mission involved in this procedure because the average student who needs a church away from home will not always of his own volition seek it out.

The university parish pastor, therefore, is obligated and committed to seek the student and to serve him through evangelism. This pastor must be an evangelist who never ceases to witness, to persuade, and to proclaim the Good News. Students make up a vital segment of the parish that he serves and a sense of mission and urgency compels him to visit among his student constituency to "seek and to save that which is lost."[2] Constantly on the alert, he uses all "the tricks of his training"

---

[1] Ibid., p. 4.

[2] Luke 19:10

and every legitimate device known to his profession to claim the university community for Christ.

It has been pointed out how the student on the university campus can be the most "lost" of individuals. Faced with a sea of problems which are peculiar to college life, he is indeed in need of a Saviour who can redeem the student from himself and from the waves of inadequacy and frustration which threaten to sink him. In this lostness he needs more than the administration of the sacraments, he needs more than the preaching and the teaching of the Word, and he needs more than the helpful arm of Christian counseling extended toward him. He also needs person-to-person confrontation which leads to encounter with Christ, through whom and through whom alone he may be saved from his lostness. This encounter with Christ which leads to decision and to commitment to God must be the final goal of campus evangelism in the eyes of the ideal university parish pastor. The preaching pastor at the near-campus church who is too busily engaged with the regular routine of local church administration to add the responsibility of student-evangelism to his daily duties should not be appointed to such a post. He is displacing a more conscientious shepherd without whose ministry the lambs may never be found or fed.

Let us look at some of the ways in which the preaching pastor can perform this function of evangelism as he relates to students. First, the ideal university parish pastor must re-examine his own commitment to God in light of his original obligation to be an evangelist. Then he must sharpen his relationship to meet the evangelistic demands of the campus. If he discovers that his aim of evangelism is to lead all members of the university community to accept the Christian faith through personal commitment to God, he must speak out of a sense of his own commitment.

The student mind to which he appeals must be convinced that he has a definite sense of commitment himself. In the words of Chester A. Pennington who advises pastors at near-campus churches, "Our evangelism must be an added invitation, 'Look what we have found. Come and see!'"[1]

Secondly, the ideal university parish pastor needs to rethink the total concept of evangelism as it relates to campus life if he is to minister to students effectively through the fourth function. The word evangelism is a "weasel word" of various and ambiguous connotations. To some the word means yesteryear's mass evangelism with emphasis on emotionalism and numbers. To others it means getting people to join the church as in most types of "visitation evangelism" (visitation and evangelism have a relationship to one another, but are often mistakenly regarded as identical). To others evangelism connotes a confrontation of individuals with the verities of the Christian gospel in such unmistakable terms that they are led into a personal experience with God and the knowledge of being accepted as his children through Christ. To others the word means nothing. Because the term suffers from vagueness, says Charles McCoy, "we must seek to clarify our thinking about it."[2]

Confusion as to the exact meaning of the word "evangelism" extends to the campus, and professional workers with students agree that there is an urgent need to rethink the entire concept and aim of evangelism as it relates to the college community. Such a process of rethinking the scope and concerns of evangelism as they touch student life is painful. It is also an on-going process which is sure about only one thing--that it MUST

---

[1]Chester A. Pennington, "Preaching the Word in the University Church," Campus Evangelism, ed. Richard N. Bender (Nashville: National Methodist Student Movement, 1957), p. 108.

[2]McCoy, op. cit., p. 16.

go forward. There is a general consensus that all of the answers to campus evangelism are not in and that the last word in the art of "soul-winning" in the university community has not yet been spoken. There have been more conferences and corporate searchings after a new and satisfying formula for campus evangelism on the part of professional bodies of student workers and denominational Boards than can be tabulated here, and the result has been a continuing wistful wonder whether a final answer will be spoken in our time. There is agreement in one area, namely, that a moral and spiritual equivalent to yesterday's soul-winning enlistment for Christ which produced outstanding results on the campus a half-century ago must be found to produce similar results today through a medium of communication which is acceptable and adaptable to the present student generation. The university parish pastor will go on praying and leaving the door open for creative research and noble experiment in this area, with his heart tuned to the mind of the Almighty.

Roger Ortmayer, in his book titled Witness to the Campus, admits that after all the helpful contributions of Religious Emphasis Weeks and the engagement of powerful preachers to get college students informed and enthused about religion have been expended, in order to kindle fires of personal conviction in the hearts of college youth there can be no substitute for actual Christian witness. He says:

> The signs and metaphors that will awaken students in a post-liberal, postskeptical age are yet to be located . . . these symbols of the encounter between God and man can come only from an active joining of the meeting.[1]

In other words, if students are to be won to Christ, the parish

---

[1]Roger Ortmayer (ed.), Witness to the Campus (Nashville: National Methodist Student Movement, 1956), p. 41.

pastor can accomplish only a small percentage of the task. Most of the work will have to be done by the students themselves, witnessing person-to-person. But a student must possess a positive faith of his own before he can share it! The parish priest can help here in aiding the student toward a growing maturity of his faith so that it can be shared. Also, the ideal university parish pastor, through his ministry in the local church can teach students how to witness. This opens up a vast area which cannot be explored at present. Some methods of teaching Christian witness will be studied in a later chapter.

The university parish pastor will perform his function of evangelism as it relates to students formally as well as informally. As some counseling is performed by mass methods, likewise some of his best efforts at evangelism will take place in the pulpit as he preaches the word with persuasive intent to reach the wills of students and arouse them to Christian decision.

The writer has already dwelt upon the necessity of the ideal pastor's preaching to the intellect of the university community to the degree that his message is precise at the point of the intellectual process. But he must also preach to the emotions. Often the deepest needs of the student are emotional, rather than intellectual. By virtue of his passing through later-adolescence the student is experiencing a succession of crises, adjustments, and discoveries which are reflected in his emotional nature. Also, these are dramatic days in his life when he is more susceptible to conversion and a variety of religious experiences through which "God bends low to whisper."

Because evangelism must be a ministry to the whole person the ideal pastor will not perform his evangelistic function at the campus completely

unless and until he has opportunities to witness informally in forum discussions, in question and answer periods, in dormitory sessions, and in person-to-person encounters with individual students. He will rethink his own definition of pastoral evangelism as including all contacts through which he contributes to outreach, witness, and the presentation of the gospel to persons. This includes the hourly and daily contacts of the pastor in the accepted forms of his ministry as well as in committee meetings, recreational and social gatherings, participation in community functions, and in all ways in which he has inter-personal contact with people when he is a vocal or silent witness.

His rethinking of evangelism will include a proper attitude toward (and knowledge of) teaching-evangelism, wherein communication of the gospel can be fostered and transmitted by meaningful experience and learning-by-doing, rather than by merely listening.

Vocational evangelism is another depth which the university parish pastor must plumb with a new sounding device. He needs to discover the thrill of the quiet type of Christian witness which is going on in the everyday world wherein, by faithful loyalty to truth and fairness in loving relations to others about them, students are continually giving witness to the faith that is within them. They have put God at the heart of all of life and by thought, word, and deed they are permitting Christ to become incarnate and to glow within them in the common walks of daily vocation.

Witnessing through Christian service, as outlined by McCoy, should be re-evaluated,[1] as well as witnessing to Christ through the

---

[1]McCoy, op. cit., pp. 52-53.

social structures.[1] The ideal pastor needs to explore the possibilities of "depth" evangelism which proceed from marked results in the integration of human personality as the result of a redemptive application of the dynamics of clinical psychology and psychotherapy. This area overlaps the function of Christian counseling.

He should be able to evaluate the claims of revivalistic evangelism and its place on the campus, with due respect for the warning of Julian N. Hartt, who says:

> Revivalism has no place in the academic community . . . because it has no legitimate place anywhere in the mission of the church. Revivalism does not take seriously the situation of the whole person in the real world. It makes no appeal to the whole man; and it is constitutionally addicted to a radical oversimplifying both of the real world and of the demands of God in Christ.
>
> . . . We cannot afford any program, any strategy, which will continue to produce fractional and fragmented Christians.[2] We need to preach the whole gospel for whole persons.

Campus evangelism must begin with the university administration, in the opinion of Harold H. Hutson.[3] It must take note of the student's relationship to the larger community and to his home community. Campus evangelism is properly a year-round emphasis which must continue all of the time in all phases of the student community, including the general attitude of the faculty as they relate their separate disciplines to the whole plan of the universe and God's scheme of community.[4]

---

[1] Ibid., p. 65.

[2] Julian N. Hartt, "The Relevance of Current Theological Thinking to Student Evangelism," Witness to the Campus, ed. Roger Ortmayer (Nashville: National Methodist Student Movement, 1956), pp. 52-53.

[3] Harold H. Hutson, "The Evangelism of The University," Witness to the Campus, ed. Roger Ortmayer (Nashville: National Methodist Student Movement, 1956), p. 104.

[4] Merrill Abbey, "Evangelism of the University Community," Witness to the Campus, ed. Roger Ortmayer (Nashville: National Methodist Student Movement, 1956), p. 22.

The ideal pastor will cooperate to the fullest extent in his support of Religious Emphasis Week or activities of a similar nature on the campus of the near-university. He will take advantage of the offer of the university to register the religious preference of enrolling students at the beginning of each semester. He will follow up the plan of the Woman's Society of Christian Service secretaries for the pre-registration of Methodist students at the colleges of their choice. He will encourage students to become members of his church, either by regular or affiliate membership. Through the facilities of the parish church he will offer them training in churchmanship. He will strongly consider the valid features of a program of systematic visitation enlistment by students among students. He will not under-estimate the significance of his evangelistic opportunity as extended to foreign students on the local campus. A number of these areas will be studied in detail when they are measured for factual observation in later chapters.

5. Administration

A final function through which it will be observed that the ideal university parish pastor has a peculiar opportunity to serve students is the function of administration. The average pastor of a local church bears much responsibility in merely administering routine details. He is required to perform all of the normal functions of his ministry on behalf of the local congregation and in the best interest of District, Conference, Area, and denomination. This can be exacting and demanding. Frequently he serves as the only bond between the District Superintendent, Cabinet, and the numerous agencies of his church. Often he is the liaison between local church and county, state, national, and world Councils, Fellowships and Federations. In the final analysis he becomes responsible for the

functioning of every committee in the church, as well as for the payment of every apportionment.

To add the responsibilities which naturally come to him through a relationship with a college campus makes just one more "bundle on the back of Sinbad." But it is a weight which can become wings when it is shouldered in dedication.

The additional tasks which the ideal university parish pastor must add to his regular routine of church business as he seeks to minister to students and the university community are as varied as they are numerous. He must be a public relations specialist for the local church as well as a promotor and representative of the foundation or student work to the Annual Conference. He has a dual obligation, first to his church in the community, and second to the college community. He must represent the local church in all relations with the college community. He becomes the liaison between "town and gown" groups. As the first official of the local church whenever there is a complaint made about administration of the church the matter comes to his desk.

He often forms the only direct link between the Annual Conference of his denomination and the student body of his parish. It is then his responsibility to represent the student work of the parish to the Annual Conference and to its related committees in a good light and to bring to the local student group the opinions of the Annual Conference. The attitude which the university parish pastor expresses towards student work on his campus when he is attending the Annual Conference and state-wide meetings can enhance or hinder his relationship to students.

There is a certain amount of "busy-work" connected with the administrative duties of the university pastor. If he has a competent staff,

the sooner he can get these details organized and into their hands the sooner he will be released for other endeavor. If, however, the pastor labors alone with limited secretarial help and is heavily dependent on voluntary leadership for student work, he will have to devise ways to get this "busy-work" done. Obviously, his final solution is to work towards the employment of a staff on a full time basis. This may take years, and in some instances it cannot be affected during his residence. But he must persevere in faith with such an objective.

Under the category of "busy-work" will be included a semester check on the tabulation of Methodist-preference students at the university. This is usually furnished by the administration on an inter-denominational basis. Since this tabulation forms a critical link between his ministry and his potential constituents, the pastor should see that the system of tabulation functions well. Also, he will keep an eye on the correlation between the number of Methodist-preference students on the campus and the number of students who come to participate in activities offered by his church--including those who are enrolled as regular or affiliate members.

Some parish churches adjacent to schools of higher education were founded originally to serve the needs of the residential community and have never developed a strong student program. Sometimes a distinct wall or barrier will be observed between community and university which is projected into the church, often provoking tensions between the regular church members and the student group. If this is true, the pastor has the obligation of organizing a college age program and promoting a cooperative and Christlike mutual concern between the "town and gown" elements of the community. In promoting these objectives the ideal university

parish pastor needs to organize and clearly interpret the functions of the Campus-Church Relations Committee and/or the Wesley Foundation Board of Directors which is to be established in every college community where The Methodist Church is at work, under the authority of paragraph 1365 of the Methodist Discipline.[1]

Certain administrative routine requires organizing and training. The value of an efficient church staff has been mentioned. If and when it becomes necessary to employ staff members such as a secretary, Foundation or student worker, or even an acceptable custodian, the parish pastor (in consultation with respective committees and boards, of course) is the key person in screening applicants and in making the final selection. In organizing his staff, the ideal university parish pastor will insist on the making of a detailed job-analysis for each member of his staff so that there may be a dignified and proper division of labor. Then each staff member will know his exact assignment. Included in the job-analysis of a Foundation Director or student worker should be a clear definition of the respective role of the local Campus-Church Relations Committee and/or the Board of Managers as they relate to him. Lacking in such agreement, the preaching pastor and the Foundation Director or student worker, who should be cooperating at all levels, may have no clearly defined policy and may even be working at cross purposes. This leads to confusion, decreased efficiency, and lowered morale.[2]

If there is no Foundation or student group organized to provide a distinctly college student program within the local church, the preaching pastor is charged with the responsibility of organizing such a group.

---

[1]Discipline for 1960, p. 379.

[2]Leiffer, op. cit., p. 65.

Full details for organizing a student group are available from the Department of College and University Religious Life of the Methodist Board of Education at Nashville, Tennessee.

When some Methodist churches that are adjacent to a college campus were established they were intended primarily to serve the residents of the community. Frequently their plants were constructed without quarters suitable for use of college groups. There were no rooms or facilities to offer students which they could call their own. Quarters had to be shared. Confusion, misunderstanding and poor relations between the regular members and the students can grow out of such an arrangement. The pastor may become involved in this situation. At this point the writer shares the conviction of Murray Leiffer who observes,

> The first responsibility here rests with the senior pastor who must be willing to cooperate cordially and interpret to both the older people and the students the values of shared Christian experience--as well as shared church kitchens.[1]

Sometimes the distance between church and campus is a measurable factor in determining the effectiveness of the program of student work. The pastor needs to study this factor and to try to solve the problems involved. Transportation may be one answer. The building or creation of a room or lounge closer to the heart of campus activity might be another solution to the problem.

The ideal university parish pastor will cooperate and be creatively helpful in cooperation with such community groups as the Faculty Christian Fellowship, the United Protestant Group, the Inter-Faith Organization, and the Civic Ministerial Association. And, since it falls within the sphere of the university parish pastor's obligation to promote participation

---

[1] Ibid., p. 102.

of students in the active program of the church (and thus teach them churchmanship), the pastor is obligated to see that such a program is organized. This will be discussed in a later chapter.

It will also be the ideal pastor's responsibility at a university situation to interpret the relation of the local church and the student group to the Methodist Student Movement, to the World's Student Christian Federation, to the United Student Christian Council, to the Conference Board of Education, and to the Inter-Conference Commission on Student Work. He must also delineate the respective roles of the Methodist Student Movement as over against the proper function of the Department of Youth Work in the Division of the Local Church. It will likewise be up to him to interpret the aims and the program of the original emphasis of the General Conference Quadrennial Commission on Christian Higher Education as to how such a program is operative and implemented at the grass roots of the college level.

A final responsibility which often must be shouldered by the university parish pastor is financial. Although the financial undergirding of the Foundation or student work properly rests with a Board of Managers and/or the local Campus-church Relations Committee, frequently it is necessary for the pastor to help. He must initiate steps throughout the year to help the Board or Committee to obtain necessary support for budget needs of the work. Portions of this budget may be supplied from the Annual Conference, the national Wesley Foundation at Nashville, the local church, alumni, students, and from others. Let the pastor never be guilty of requiring the Wesley Foundation director to raise his own salary or of thrusting the burden of the budget onto the student worker, as has been known to happen.

B. Summary

In summary of this chapter we note that five fundamental functions of the ideal pastor at the university parish have been projected: namely, preaching, counseling, teaching, evangelism, and administration. Under the function of preaching it was pointed out that in addition to the general qualifications demanded of a Methodist preacher the university pastor must be able to speak in a manner that is relevant to the needs of students. He needs a solid theological foundation for his communicative effort, and his theology must be geared to the philosophy of the Methodist Student Movement.

In regard to the function of counseling, the value of a thorough understanding by the counselor of the psychology and the problems of the later-adolescent was indicated. The importance of a pastor's training in counseling was stressed, and the proper relationship between counseling and exercise of the preaching function was emphasized. The general principles of pastoral counseling as they relate to the university pastor's opportunity to serve students was explained, and a warning about temptations and dangers involved was included.

Regarding the teaching function, the writer outlined the opportunities and advantages that are open to the university parish pastor as he strives to serve students through this medium. Although chances for formal teaching are limited, he needs to be trained in the following: the disciplines of scholarship, the dynamics of education and religious education, and in the possibilities that are open to members of the college faculty to learn to teach their respective disciplines with religious perspective. His proper acquaintance with faculty fellowship movements was described. The importance of his knowledge and his ability to interpret

the legal implications of state laws as they affect the teaching of religion and religious guidance on the campus was noted.

Under the fourth function, a verbal picture was presented demonstrating the ambiguity of the term "evangelism" as understood by campus ministers and students. The obligations of the university pastor to be grounded in his own faith, to discover the most effective methods of campus evangelism, to rethink the total concept of evangelism as it applies to the campus, and to be aware of the possibilities that are open to students as they witness through every day vocation and Christian service were explained.

Regarding the final function of administration, the chapter outlined the need for the pastor's organizing the details and "busy-work" of his office in such a manner that he would be released for larger endeavor. The importance of the pastor as a link between the various groups of the college community was explained. How the pastor can adapt the facilities of the local church to the needs of students, how his cooperation with organizations of students and faculty members is important, how the pastor has a responsibility to interpret the relationship of the local church and student group to the wider aspects of student work, and how important the pastor's financial responsibility for undergirding student work becomes were set forth. The prototype or model of the ideal pastor in the university parish having been projected, in the next chapter the writer will outline the basic methods followed in the study.

PART II

THE INSTRUMENT:

PROCEDURE AND ANALYSIS

CHAPTER VII

PROCEDURE

Having set the problem of the study within the framework of religion in higher education, and the prototype of the ideal university parish pastor having been projected, in Part II of this dissertation the writer will attempt to discover what is actually being done in the field by Methodist preaching pastors across the nation as they minister to students. In light of these findings he will attempt later to determine to what degree these pastors measure up to the standards of the hypothetical norm of the ideal pastor that have been established.

In this chapter the writer will outline procedure by which the questionnaire used in this study was designed and distributed. The chapter will be concluded with the presentation of an analysis of statistical returns.

A. Procedure With the Questionnaire

A study of this kind must be based on firmer ground and upon more representative data than can be furnished by reading, scholastic research, experience, observation and personal interviews. In order to gain as much additional information as possible in a brief time, the writer decided that in addition to the above sources of information he would use a questionnaire. Therefore, a carefully designed questionnaire was mailed to Methodist university parish pastors throughout the nation. The writer is aware of the shortcomings of the questionnaire method of

measurement, but this appeared to be the most practical way to secure an abundance of additional factual data in a limited time. The remainder of this section of the dissertation will deal with (1) designing the questionnaire, (2) mailing the instrument, and (3) the geographical distribution of the instrument.

1. Designing the Questionnaire

In collaboration with Dr. Hiel Bollinger, of the Department of College and University Religious Life of the Methodist Board of Education, and under the direction of Professor Clarence P. Shedd, former professor at Yale University and head of the department of Religion in higher education at Pacific School for Religion from 1957 to 1959, a seven page questionnaire was designed for the sampling.[1] The preparation of the instrument was a major task that took more than a year. Prior to distribution it was revised several times in light of criticism by authorities in religion in higher education, fellow colleagues in college parishes, Wesley Foundation directors, professional student workers, and scores of mature Methodist youth of college and graduate school age.

The drafting of comprehensive questions to send to nearly 500 pastors of different background, age-level, theological preparation, and experience with the expectation of receiving uniform response presented a major problem. Care was taken in wording the instrument so that the sampling could be effected without bias or prejudice. For obvious reasons it seemed advisable to avoid questions which reflected the specific points of view of differing schools of theology and individual theologians.

---

[1]For copy of questionnaire used in this study, see Appendix A, p. 521.

Considerable variance in the theological and social points of view of the respective respondents was expected. The writer also anticipated a wide diversity in replies due to geographical distribution, pastoral experience, reading and scholastic preparation, age of the men involved, and the different concepts that pastors have towards the pastoral functions selected in this study for specialized study, i.e., preaching, counseling, teaching, evangelism and administration.

For example, in designing questions for the section on counseling, it was to be assumed that there would be a variation of replies regarding the function of counseling from men in the older age bracket as contrasted with replies from men recently graduated from seminary. This difference might be predicted because men who have been graduated from seminary for fifteen or twenty years and have not kept up their reading in this field might not have discovered the potential contribution that counseling has to offer students. The same could be said regarding contrasting concepts held by men of various ages in the areas of religious education, evangelism, and preaching.

The problem of making the instrument of inquiry general enough to keep respondents from becoming lost in questions and debate and yet specific enough to elicit data of sufficient value for tabulation was pondered. The problem of designing a questionnaire simple enough in appearance so as not to discourage busy pastors, yet challenging enough in content to encourage creative reply was carefully weighed.

Eventually the questionnaire was devised around the five operative functions of the university parish pastor as he more commonly relates to students, i.e., preaching, counseling, teaching, evangelism, and

administration. Two pages of questions covering institutional, plant, program, and general pastoral data were included for the purpose of gathering statistics with which to correlate salient functional findings. The concluding five pages of the instrument were designed to deal with the five operative functions of the university parish pastor listed above. The questionnaire will be presented in some detail in the next chapter.[1]

2. Mailing the Questionnaire

Three personal letters were enclosed with the instrument for mailing. The first letter was an appeal from the writer soliciting the cooperation of respondents with the promise of a summary of the findings when they became available.[2] It stated the aims of the nation-wide study and was worded so as to encourage as wide participation as possible. The second enclosure was a photographed reproduction of a personal letter by Dr. H. D. Bollinger on the letterhead of the Methodist Board of Education at Nashville in which he strongly urged the cooperation of the addressees in the corporate enterprise.[3] The final personal letter was a warm commendation of the project by Professor Clarence P. Shedd.[4] The questionnaires were mailed by first-class mail and a first-class stamped envelope was enclosed to insure return. Copies of these letters will be found in the Appendix.

Because of the widespread geographical involvement of American Methodist parish pastors who minister to college students, the writer felt

---

[1]Below, p. 176.

[2]See Appendix A, p. 518.

[3]Ibid., p. 519.

[4]Ibid., p. 520.

that the only way to secure a fair and unbiased corporate picture would be through a national survey. To do this it was necessary to obtain a mailing list of these pastors. This presented a problem. Although Methodist student work of some sort is allegedly carried on at over 600 so-called centers of higher education in this country, there is no single directory or guide which gives an accurate listing of all these preaching pastors by name and address. The only official listing of all Methodist pastors is to be found in the General Minutes of the Annual Conferences of The Methodist Church[1] or in the yearly journals of the respective Annual Conferences. But in these journals there is no listing according to university parish pulpit category.

The only available list of pastors which could be used for proper sampling proved to be the Directory of the Methodist Student Movement, published annually by the Board of Education at Nashville.[2] As pointed out earlier, the Methodist Student Movement is a loosely organized composite body automatically embracing Methodist Colleges, Wesley Foundations, interdenominational student Christian organizations, and other organized campus units of the Movement.[3] It includes the names of Wesley Foundation directors and associate directors, college chaplains, co-ordinators of religion, student advisors, sponsors of student Christian associations, counselors, conference executive secretaries, Methodist Student Movement

---

[1]Statistical Office of the Methodist Church, General Minutes of the Annual Conferences of The Methodist Church (Chicago: Council on World Service and Finance, 1959).

[2]The Directory of the Methodist Student Movement, op. cit.

[3]Above, p. 65.

directors, as well as pastors of university parish Methodist churches. So far as the reader can tell the above are names of Methodists only, and they are listed in the Directory whether they claim an active relation to the Movement or not.

The Directory is catalogued by states and colleges within the states. Some colleges list as many as a dozen ministerial and lay persons who have local church relations with the school. In some college towns there are several schools clustered around one community church which serves them, and in other college communities from one to six Methodist churches claim to do student work at the same institution. With such a multiple listing, therefore, exactly who all of the preaching pastors at college situation across the nation was difficult to determine. Furthermore, it seemed advisable to limit distribution of the instruments to pastors of churches serving four year colleges. It became difficult to separate pastors serving four year colleges from pastors serving junior colleges. Also, questionnaires were to be distributed only to senior or preaching pastors, and not to associate or assistant pastors. And under no circumstances were the instruments to be returned by Wesley Foundation or student workers. Those that were returned by the latter were to be rejected.

3. The Geographical Distribution

At the beginning the writer decided to send out the questionnaires by states and to tabulate them according to the same geographical distribution. Later it was decided to tabulate returns by jurisdictions instead of by states, with the expectation that a comparison of similarities and

differences between the jurisdictions would produce more valuable data. This method also insured getting the instruments into the hands of a representative number of pastors in every section of the nation, thus guaranteeing proportionate coverage across the country. No state or jurisdiction was deliberately favored or ignored in the distribution.

Boundaries of the respective jurisdictions of the Methodist Church canvassed are the same as those defined in paragraphs 2036 to 2041 of the Methodist Discipline for 1960;[1] namely, Western, North Central, Northeastern, South Central, and Southeastern. Respective states within the various jurisdiction are catalogued as follows:

WESTERN JURISDICTION--Arizona, California, Colorado, Idaho, Nevada, Montana, Oregon, Utah, Washington, Wyoming.

NORTH CENTRAL JURISDICTION--Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Michigan, Minnesota, Ohio, North Dakota, South Dakota, Wisconsin.

NORTHEASTERN JURISDICTION--Connecticut, Delaware, District of Columbia, Maine, Maryland, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New York, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, Vermont, West Virginia.

SOUTH CENTRAL JURISDICTION--Arkansas, Kansas, Louisiana, Missouri, Nebraska, New Mexico, Oklahoma, Texas.

SOUTHEASTERN JURISDICTION--Alabama, Florida, Georgia, Kentucky, Mississippi, North Carolina, South Carolina, Tennessee, Virginia.

At the time the questionnaire was distributed some Methodist student work was being carried on in Alaska and Hawaii, but it was of a junior college nature, and also at that time those two former territories were not official states--hence they were not included in this survey.

---

[1]Discipline for 1960, pp. 711-718.

This study will make one notable exception to following the prescribed Methodist jurisdictional system of segregation in that there will be no recognition of the Central (Negro) Jurisdiction as designated by paragraph 2038 of the Methodist Discipline.[1] The reason for this decision is because there is no provision made by the Methodist Student Movement and its constituent bodies for the recognition of the Central Jurisdiction. It is significant that Methodist students have outdone their elders by many years in their struggle against segregation. It was impossible to tell from the listing in the Directory which pastors were Negro and which pastors were white, and it was impossible to tell which responses were received from Negro pastors as differentiated from the replies of white preachers. Replies were solicited from as many Negro university parish pastors as would respond, irrespective of state, jurisdiction or racial distinction.

The 422 questionnaires were mailed to Methodist preaching pastors throughout the United States according to the distribution by states indicated in Table 1.

The distribution of the questionnaires by jurisdictions according to the Methodist system of states contained in their respective boundaries is illustrated in Table 2. According to this plan of distribution it is noted that more than one-quarter of the Methodist university parish pastors canvassed in this nationwide survey are located in the Southeastern Jurisdiction, with the North Central Jurisdiction tallying nearly as many.

More than one-half of the total number of pastors surveyed reside in the Southeastern and North Central areas of the United States. The

---

[1] Ibid., pp. 714-715.

TABLE 1

DISTRIBUTION BY STATES

Alabama	10	Nebraska	6
Arizona	3	Nevada	1
Arkansas	11	New Hampshire	4
California	17	New Jersey	6
Colorado	6	New Mexico	3
Connecticut	3	New York	11
Delaware	2	North Carolina	16
District of Columbia	3	North Dakota	5
Florida	8	Ohio	24
Georgia	19	Oklahoma	13
Idaho	3	Oregon	8
Illinois	13	Pennsylvania	11
Indiana	7	Rhode Island	2
Iowa	12	South Carolina	10
Kansas	8	South Dakota	10
Kentucky	13	Tennessee	14
Louisiana	8	Texas	20
Maine	6	Utah	2
Maryland	8	Vermont	3
Massachusetts	6	Virginia	11
Michigan	9	Washington	6
Minnesota	8	West Virginia	7
Mississippi	10	Wisconsin	13
Missouri	9	Wyoming	1
Montana	5	TOTAL	422

TABLE 2

DISTRIBUTION BY JURISDICTIONS

Jurisdiction	Number distributed	Per cent of total
Western	52	12.3
North Central	102	24.0
Northeastern	80	18.9
South Central	78	18.5
Southeastern	111	26.3
Totals	422	100.0

South Central Jurisdiction has about as many pastors concerned with student work as the Northeastern Jurisdiction.

Nearly two-thirds of the pastors canvassed (61 per cent) live east of the Mississippi River. More than one-third of them (39 per cent) are found west of the same boundary. Percentages show that the smallest number of pastors concerned in this study reside in the far west. In the Western Jurisdiction and in the North Central area the number of Methodist university preaching centers matches the density of population, i.e., the west is more sparsely populated and has fewer college situations. The North Central area is more heavily populated and has a correspondingly larger number of university pulpits.

The writer will now present an analysis of statistical returns.

B. Analysis of Statistical Returns

An analysis of returns revealed pertinent information which will be reported in this fashion. First the writer will present a summary statement of statistical returns. This will be followed by a review of the related statistical data.

1. Summary Statement of Returns

Through the assistance of the office of the Department of College and University Religious Life of the Board of Education at Nashville the first mailing of the instrument was made to 415 of the university parish pastors listed in the Directory on February 1, 1958. A total of 181 respondents replied to the first mailing for a percentage of 43.6. Several weeks later a second mailing was sent out to the 234 pastors who had failed to respond to the first mailing. Seven new names were added to

this list, which brought the second mailing up to 241 and raised the total number of pastors canvassed to 422. Included in the second mailing was a second letter from the writer which offered a brief review about returns to date and urged the immediate completion of the instruments by the addressees.[1]

There were ninety responses to the second mailing, which raised the total number of replies to 271, out of a grand total sampling of 422--or a return ratio of 64.4 per cent. However, for reasons which will be explained later,[2] forty-seven of the replies were invalid and had to be rejected. This left a total of 224 valid instruments for tabulation. As against the 422 instruments which were sent out, the ratio of valid instruments which were returned figured 53.2 per cent.

Since the 53.2 per cent return of valid replies was distributed representatively across the nation according to states and jurisdictions, and since the responses appeared to be sufficient in number to warrant a true sampling, the writer felt that a third mailing of the complete instrument was not necessary. However, in order to satisfy additional questions entertained by the writer about the 35.6 per cent of the pastors who failed to respond to either of the two mailings, he decided to sample the "no-returns." This was accomplished by sending a brief letter and a summary questionnaire to one in five of the pastors who had not responded to the original mailings.[3] There was a 63.3 per cent return to this

---

[1]See Appendix B, p. 528.

[2]Below, p. 165.

[3]See Appendix C, p. 529.

final spot-sampling, which will be described later in this chapter. Let us turn now to a more detailed analysis of statistical findings.

2. Break-down of Statistical Returns

This section of the analysis will be divided into five sub-divisions; namely, (1) the instruments returned, (2) the instruments not returned, (3) the rejected instruments, (4) the valid instruments returned, and (5) the final spot sampling of the "no-returns."

a. Instruments returned: In response to the mailing of questionnaires to 422 university parish pastors, there was a total of 271 replies. Respondents returning replies were located in the respective jurisdictions of The Methodist Church in the United States according to the summary in Table 3.

TABLE 3

NUMBER OF INSTRUMENTS RETURNED

Jurisdiction	Number of instruments returned	Percentage of jurisdictional returns	Per cent of national returns
Western	44	84.5	16.2
North Central	62	61.4	22.9
Northeastern	48	60.0	17.8
South Central	53	67.9	19.5
Southeastern	64	57.7	23.5
Total	271	-- -	100.0

Although the Western Jurisdiction returned the smallest number of instruments of all five areas in the United States, it tabulated the

highest percentage of returns in relation to the number distributed--or 84.5 per cent. This area accounted for 16.2 per cent of the national returns. On the other hand, while the Southeastern Jurisdiction sent back the largest number of replies, this area made the poorest per capita showing, returning only 57.7 per cent of its potential returns but accounting for nearly one quarter of the nation's replies.

Although approximately the same number of instruments was distributed in the South Central Jurisdiction as was distributed in the Northeastern Jurisdiction, the South Central area returned a higher percentage of replies (68.9) as contrasted with Northeastern's 60.0 per cent. Table 3 shows that North Central scored the second best record in percentage of returns, with South Central and Northeastern running close behind for third and fourth honors, respectively. Southeastern tallied in last place.

Returns from North Central indicate that respondents from that jurisdiction, which is heavily dotted with college related churches, received the study with more understanding and took more pains in filling out the questionnaire. This might indicate a deeper understanding of the motive behind the study, and hence might reflect a deeper desire to cooperate. This will bear watching when returns from that area are tabulated.

There was an observable correlation between the smaller number of near-campus situations in the Western Jurisdiction and the sparse population of that area. For example, Nevada, a state with limited population, has only one institution of higher education. Therefore, there was only one reply received from that state. The writer also noted that the Southeastern Jurisdiction outranked all other areas in potential returns, yet

the smallest percentage of replies came from that area. The reasons for this discrepancy do not come clear through observation of the data. It is agreed that Methodist pro rata membership is high in the Southeast. It is possible, however, that although Methodist churches in the Southeast are numerous, their small size and limited budgets may prohibit the employment of a professional student worker. Consequently, less student work is performed in these churches than in northern jurisdictions. According to such reasoning the pastors of such churches would be reluctant to respond to a detailed questionnaire which implies that some student work is going on in their near-campus churches.

If the above is true, perhaps it is in this area that a high percentage of "single-pastor" situations exist where the preacher in charge has limited secretarial help and must depend largely upon voluntary help to aid him in student work. Probably such pastors need the knowledge discovered in this study more than others. Although data returned do not firmly support this line of reasoning, some inferences may be drawn from remarks inscribed between the lines by some of the Southeastern respondents. These will be weighed in a later chapter.

b. Instruments not returned: There was a total of 143 "no-returns" of the original mailings. By jurisdictions they were distributed as follows: Western, eight, for a total of 15.4 per cent of the number of instruments sent to that area; North Central, thirty-nine, for a total of 38.2 per cent; Northeastern, thirty-two, for a total of 40 per cent; South Central, twenty-five, for a total of 32.1 per cent; and Southeastern, forty-seven, for a total of 42.3 per cent of the number of questionnaires sent to that jurisdiction. Although these percentages

are reversed from those given for the returns of the respective jurisdictions as indicated in Table 3, the perspective is sharpened by stating them inversely. In spite of the liberal national returns of the questionnaire, these figures emphasized the question, "What is the reason for this larger number of no-returns from the Southeast?" It also pointed up the geographical distribution of the sources of valid data received for this study, and it revealed gaps in the supply of data which needed to be sampled before final tabulation.

c. Rejected instruments:

TABLE 4

REJECTED INSTRUMENTS

Jurisdiction	Number of instruments rejected	Number of instruments returned	Percentage of jurisdictional rejections
Western	9	44	20.5
North Central	3	62	4.8
Northeastern	12	48	25.0
South Central	8	53	15.1
Southeastern	15	64	23.5
Totals	47	271	-- -

A total of forty-seven of the 271 questionnaires returned were rejected. As observed in Table 4, the largest number of rejected instruments came from the Southeastern Jurisdiction, and the smallest number of rejected instruments came from North Central. One-quarter of the returns from Northeastern were defective, which gave that area the highest percentage of rejections recorded. The least number of rejections noted was

from North Central, even though this area returned nearly twice as many replies as were returned by Southeastern.

Although the Western Jurisdiction returned the highest percentage of instruments in the nation, 20 per cent of them were rejected. There appears to be no reasonable explanation for such a failing, unless it is because this is a newer country and the scene of many mushrooming junior colleges. The South Central Jurisdiction, which is more settled in history and tradition, outranked her sister to the west in the matter of fewer rejections.

The causes for rejection of the forty-seven instruments which were found defective merit comment at this juncture. Twenty-five blank questionnaires were returned by pastors who stated that for various reasons their churches could not be classified as college parish churches. Even though their churches were located close enough to a college campus to be on the mailing list of the Methodist Student Movement, they claimed to have no connection with a student group. Since these instruments were not even filled out, obviously they had to be discarded. Eleven instruments were returned by Wesley Foundation or professional student workers who were not able to answer all the questions because they were not preaching pastors. These were returned in spite of repeated specific instructions, "This study is for <u>preaching pastors</u> and NOT for Wesley Foundation or student workers." Inasmuch as any attempt to tabulate these fragmentary returns would throw total findings askew, they were rejected.

There were four returns from professional college Directors of Student Activities, and two returns from college chaplains which had to be rejected because these respondents were unable to complete the

questionnaire from the perspective of a preaching pastor. Instruments returned by the dean of a girl's school and the religious director of a preparatory school were also rejected.

There were three replies from pastors at junior college situations which had to be rejected for reasons which have been noted previously. From the vantage point of six years as pastor at a junior college situation, as opposed to ten years of residence in a senior college situation, the writer concurs with the judgment of a number of observers that great diversity exists between the two types of schools which requires the local parish pastor to use different methods in his ministry to students. For example, there are fundamental differences in administrative policy, traditions, size and type of enrollment, policy concerning religion, as well as marked disparity in the presence or absence of adequate religious leadership between the two types of schools.[1] Problems of the institutions involved are basically different. A high percentage of junior college students are commuters who live at home. School busses gather them up daily as far away as forty or fifty miles in neighboring towns that have no post-high school educational facilities to offer their youth, yet they are willing to pay junior college taxes to a neighboring school district. There appears to be no effective way for the pastor of a local church to minister acceptably to these commuting students.

Also, it is observed that junior college students go to school for different reasons than students attend four-year schools. Leiffer found that half the junior college students in three western states regard their

---

[1]Murray H. Leiffer, Methodist Student Work at the Colleges of Arizona, California, and Nevada (Upland, Indiana: A. D. Freese and Sons, 1951), p. 14.

education as terminal training.[1] He likewise discovered that directors of junior colleges are more determined than administrators of full colleges and universities to prevent various groups from conducting religious programs on their campus.[2] In 1951 he found no Methodist student organizations at junior colleges in the state of California, where junior colleges have had the most rapid rate of expansion in the nation.[3] He also discovered that the whole concept of the junior college was in such a pioneer state of development that pastors serving parish churches near them invariably were so engrossed with their normal pastoral administrative duties that to date they had not thought of the junior college as an integral part of their parish.[4]

In fairness, however, to pastors serving Methodist churches in junior college situations at the present date, the writer must admit that since the publication of Leiffer's study there has been marked improvement in the indication of California junior college administrators to recognize and to deal with the problem of religion in higher education. This indication has been matched by a corresponding willingness of many California Methodist pastors at junior college situations to try to do something about the problem. The above indications are attested by the findings of the Davis Conference of the California Junior College Association on Moral and Spiritual Values held at Davis, California, January 31 to February 2, 1958, in cooperation with the department of

---

[1] Ibid., p. 80.

[2] Ibid., p. 14.

[3] Ibid., p. 80.

[4] Ibid., p. 104.

Religion in Higher Education of The Pacific School of Religion and supported by the Edward W. Hazen Foundation.[1] But since most of the improvement in the junior college position has taken place in California, and since there is still much discrepancy between the junior college situation and the four year college situation across the nation, the writer concluded that pastors serving junior college parish churches should be excluded from the sampling. This decision does not imply that junior college students do not need the religious guidance of a parish pastor, and it does not excuse Methodist pastors in junior college situations from their obligation to develop an effective program of student work in their respective parishes.

d. Valid instruments returned: Subtracting the forty-seven rejected instruments from the 271 questionnaires returned left a total of 224 valid instruments for tabulation. Distribution of the returns of these valid instruments is shown in Table 5. Here it is observed that the North Central area returned more than one-fourth of the nation's total number of valid instruments, whereas the poorest showing was made by Western which returned only 15 per cent of the nation's total. North Central also scored the highest percentage of valid returns of the total number of instruments returned by a jurisdiction. Northeastern made the poorest showing in this regard.

3. Sampling of the "No-returns"

In order further to confirm similarities and differences revealed

---

[1]The California Junior College Association, Moral and Spiritual Values in California Junior Colleges, Proceedings of the Davis Conference held at the University of California at Davis, California, January 31-February 2, 1958.

TABLE 5

VALID INSTRUMENTS RETURNED

Jurisdiction	Valid instruments returned	Per cent of jurisdictional returns	Per cent of national returns
Western	35	79.5	15.6
North Central	59	95.0	26.3
Northeastern	36	75.0	16.2
South Central	45	85.0	20.0
Southeastern	49	76.5	21.9
Totals	224	-- -	100.0

by data from the 53.2 per cent returns, a final sampling was prepared to canvas the "no-returns." A condensed one-page questionnaire was devised covering salient points contained in the original instrument, together with a third letter from the writer asking why the respondent had not replied to previous mailings.[1] Thirty of these third and final appeals were mailed to approximately one in every five of the 151 non-replying potential respondents. Extreme care was taken to distribute this third mailing with due regard to states and jurisdictions where the proportion of responses had been poorest. This insured a wider coverage and a more representative sampling of pastors across the nation. Addresses for this final mailing were selected by lot. In response to the third mailing there was a total of nineteen replies, or a return of 63.3 per cent. These data are summarized in Table 6.

[1]See Appendix C, p. 529.

TABLE 6

SAMPLING OF THE "NO-RETURNS"

Jurisdiction	Samplings distributed	Samplings returned	Per cent of jurisdictional returns
Western	2	1	50.0
North Central	8	6	75.0
Northeastern	6	3	50.0
South Central	5	5	100.0
Southeastern	9	4	44.5
Totals	30	19	-- -

State and jurisdictional sources of spot-check sampling were observed, California, of Western, had one return. Six states of North Central returning one sampling each were Illinois, Iowa, Michigan, Ohio, South Dakota, and Wisconsin. There were three states in the Northeastern Jurisdiction returning one sampling each: Maine, New Jersey, and Pennsylvania. Four states from South Central responded as follows: Missouri with two, and one each from Arkansas, Nebraska, and New Mexico. Southeastern returned four samplings scattered among three states; namely, South Carolina with two returns and Alabama and Georgia with one each. It is significant that the nineteen samplings returned in this spot-checking came from seventeen different states. Only two states (Missouri and South Carolina) returned two samplings. The other seventeen states returned only one sampling each.

These returns by states illustrate how the sampling was distributed representatively across the nation according to the proportionate number of "no-returns." The figures also indicate a more representative

return of areas canvassed. Thus, they appear to confirm data received in the original returns. According to the visualized summary in Table 6, it will be noted that South Central was the most responsive jurisdiction responding to this sampling. It tabulated a 100 per cent return. North Central, which was third highest in return of the original instruments, did exceptionally well with a 75 per cent return. Northeastern showed the poorest record in this project.

This final "spot-check" proved to be valuable in that its results revealed some correlation with results tabulated from the original returns. It strengthened the probability that the survey is representative and gave assurance that data provide a true sampling. While this sampling furnished an unbiased testing of the "no-returns," because of the limited nature of the sampling instrument it was deemed improper to include these nineteen replies with the 224 valid returns. They did not provide enough details comparable to the more comprehensive data returned in the original mailings. Therefore, the writer felt that the number of valid replies useable for tabulation and observation should be held at 224, for a percentage of 53.2. This is the percentage that will be used throughout the study.

C. Summary

In this chapter the writer explained the designing of the questionnaire and outlined the plan of its distribution according to states and jurisdictions. He also made an analysis of statistical returns which summarized details concerning the number of instruments returned, the number of instruments not returned, the number of instruments rejected and the causes for their rejection, and a sampling of the

"no-returns." It was then concluded that there were sufficient data at hand from representative sources across the nation to assure findings that are reasonably factual.

The writer feels that it is reasonable to presume that there might have been a higher proportion of instruments returned had it not been for errors in the Directory whereby some wrong names appeared listed as pastors of near-campus churches. Such errors are due to death, the passing of time, and the inevitable shifting of preachers who enjoy an itinerant ministry. If 20 per cent of the pastors stationed at Methodist churches move during any given conference year--some time during the year and the others at the time of the Annual Conference session--this would mean an annual moving of eighty-four pastors among the 422 churches canvassed. And since the completed returns of the instrument were spread over a period covering two Annual Conference sessions, there was a possibility of more than 150 changes of pastors while this survey was being made. While it is reasonable to presume that most of these changes would have been noted in the annual publication of the Directory, its publishers admit their fallibility when they declare in bold letters on the title page, "Corrections will be happily received."[1]

This points up the probability that some of the instruments were ignored because they were addressed to the wrong men. One note came back from a pastor's widow who replied, "My husband just died." Also, the percentage of final returns was no doubt pared by the number of pastors who were in the process of either leaving a station or just arriving when the instrument came to their desks. Probably both were reluctant to

---

[1]Directory of the Methodist Student Movement.

reply--the departing preachers because of the multiplicity of duties involved in packing, and the new arrivals because they had not yet been able to find their way around in the new charge.

In concluding this chapter on Procedure, the writer would like to state that he had hoped to slant this study somewhat in the direction of pastors who preach at smaller college situations across the nation where, because of the handicaps of size, limited budgets, and lack of interest, they have no professional student worker to help them and little encouragement to extend the arm of the church toward students. Nevertheless, it is agreed that these pastors have students in their congregations who require a peculiar type of ministry. In order to supply this ministry these pastors need special training and experience. But singling out these particular pastors for help in this study presented a formidable problem. In the first place, there was no designation of these pastors made in the Directory. And, when the data were tabulated it was discovered that a majority of those who returned completed instruments were pastors at situations where there was professional help available. In short, a number of those pastors who probably need the help of this study most did not respond at all. Exactly why they failed to reply in greater numbers is not revealed. Their failure to reply might indicate their need. They might have been too busy with routine duties in the local church, too involved with building campaigns, or simply too far removed from the prospects of receiving enough aid from this study to reply. Again, possibly the questionnaire was too complicated to be relevant to their special situations.

Therefore, since most of the measurable data received for this study were returned from better organized parishes, the final conclusions of this dissertation must be concerned primarily with pastors of such churches. The writer profoundly hopes, however, that the lone pastor who serves a college parish without the services of a trained assistant and who is forced to depend upon volunteers to help him in student work will be aided in his ministry to the campus by a careful examination of the findings revealed in this study.

Initial methods of procedure having been established, in the next chapter the writer will present the questionnaire used in this study.

CHAPTER VIII

THE QUESTIONNAIRE

Care was taken to assemble the questionnaire so that it would present attractive eye-appeal and assure as wide a sampling of valid measurable response as possible. The instrument was professionally typed on an IBM machine in boldface readable type and sharply duplicated on substantial bond paper, with allowance made for plenty of white space between the lines and around the margin. Seven complete pages composed the "lay-out" of the instrument. The final five pages were reserved for questions dealing with the five respective functions of the university parish pastor as they relate to student life.

Pages one and two called for institutional and general data, as well as for plant and program information. The writer felt that page one should be restricted to a few fundamental questions which would appear interesting enough to invite shared participation, yet simple enough in appearance so as not to discourage filling it out quickly. The writer also felt that if the respondent went to the trouble of filling out the more simple questions on the first two pages, by the time he got to the heart of the instrument on page three he would be more willing to complete the instrument than he might be if heavier questions requiring more creative reflection were used on the opening page. In short, it appeared to be better psychology to list the simpler questions first and introduce weightier questions later.

A. Page One: Institutional and General Data[1]

Page one called for the name and address of the pastor responding. Assurance was given to the respondent that the information would be kept confidential. Other facts called for at the top of the page were the name of the church, the city, the state, and the Annual Conference involved. The number of members on the church roll and the name of the related college were also asked. Directions for returning the instrument were enclosed in a box in the upper right hand corner where it would be seen readily.

A three by five card-form was devised to receive the above listed information when it became available. Cards were prepared with a code marking so that they might be used as a reference file of respondents. Also, the writer thought that the file could be used as a convenient aid in mailing the promised returns to respondents upon completion of the study.

At the beginning it was not clear as to what use might be made of the Conference designation of the church involved, but since it had been decided to tabulate returns according to jurisdictional distribution the writer assumed that the classification by Conferences as well as by states would aid here.

It was conceived that the size of the membership of the church would be valuable for several reasons, so this question concluded the statistical inquiry at the top of the page.

A total of ten questions were then asked on the space remaining on page one, under the headings of Institutional and General Data. Upon

---

[1]See Appendix A, p. 521.

observation of each of these questions, the writer will make running comment as to why they were included in the instrument:

1. Name of college or university to which parish is related

_____

The significance of this question is obvious.

2. Check classification of institution: a. Methodist _____
b. State _____
c. Independent ___
d. Other _____

It seemed important to discover the exact classification of the school involved. It is understandable that there are significant differences in policies of religion, historic traditions, sociological variance, and administrative and faculty attitudes reflected on campuses of different types.[1] The correlation of a number of factors in this study depends upon data supplied by question 2.

3. Number of regular (full time) students enrolled at the institution _____

4. How many Methodist-preference students on your campus? _____

5. How many of these Meth-preference students do you reach? _____

a. vitally _____
b. casually _____
c. Total _____

6. How many of these Meth-preference students are listed on your Church Roll?
a. As regular full members _____
b. As affiliate members _____
c. Total _____

These four questions were grouped together because they are related to one another, and without any one of them the basic statistical

---

[1] Above, pp. 152 ff.

measurement of the universe involved would be impossible. Upon the degree of variance of answers to this block of questions depends the possibility of significant correlation with a number of factors which should produce valuable information.

Since it is accepted by the Board of Education of The Methodist Church that about 16 per cent of the students who are enrolled in the four year colleges and universities of America express a preference for The Methodist Church upon registration, one might be able to determine with a reasonable degree of accuracy the number of Methodist-preference students which would be found on the campus of any given institution of higher learning--providing he knew the size of the enrollment of the school. (Of course this might not be true at a denominational college other then Methodist where Methodist-preference students understandable might be less numerous than the average number of 16 per cent. Again, it might not be true on the campus of a Methodist-related school where the ratio of Methodist-preference students presumably would be higher.)

The over-all effectiveness of a pastor's ministry to students presumably ought to be reflected in the number of students who are enrolled in the student programs of his church. There should be correlation between the size of the school, the size of the church, and the number of Methodist-preference students on the campus. By the same reasoning, the writer would assume that there should be a significant relationship between the ministry of the preaching pastor and the number of students he reaches "vitally" and "casually."[1] He would assume also that there should be

---

[1]The terms "vitally" and "casually" will be used by the writer throughout this dissertation to signify the relationship of the university parish pastor with students on the campus in the same way in which

correlation between the way the pastor does his work and the number of students on the campus who became affiliated with the local church, either as full members or in the affiliate relationship. The categories of "vitally" and "casually," as listed under question five in the questionnaire, indicate the degree of service rendered to students by virtue of their active participation in any or all of the program offered to them by the local church. It would be expected that the "vitally" related students would be a smaller group than the "casually" related students.

When tabulated returns from question 6 are related to returns from questions 3,4, and 5; and again, when they are related to the number of years the pastor has been serving in a university parish church, to his training, and to his experience--it is anticipated that significant correlation will be revealed.

7. What type of organized student group do you have in your church?
(a) Wesley Foundation _____; (b) Wesley Fellowship _____;
(c) None _____; (d) Other (name it) _____

The writer thought that this question would reveal valuable data. It was slanted at the wide variety of student situations across the nation.

8. What is the average attendance of your college-age group at
   a. Sunday A.M. worship service? _____
   b. Sunday eve youth meetings? _____
   c. Sunday A.M. class or study group? _____
   d. A planned recreational activity? _____
   e. Other activity? (name it) _____

While attendance alone may prove a biased basis for judgment, in relation to other factors involved this question becomes important. The

---

the Wesley Foundation claims relationship with students, according to the information blank supplied for Commissions on Standards for Wesley Foundations as authorized by paragraph 1367 of the Methodist Discipline. This form, which is designated as Form B, Wesley Foundations and published by the Department of College and University Religious Life of the Board of Education of The Methodist Church, defines the word "vitally" as meaning "those whose lives are being changed, molded and matured in the Wesley Foundation experience." The word "casually" is defined as "those who have participated in one or more activities of the Wesley Foundation during the school year."

writer surmized that the types of group activity of the students involved (as well as their quality and their degree of creative participation) might indicate the kind of a relation the pastor enjoys with students. Therefore, question 8 was asked.

9. Using 1,2,3,4,5 rate in order of their importance the following FUNCTIONS of the university parish pastor which relate to students:

   a. Preaching _____
   b. Counseling _____
   c. Teaching _____
   d. Evangelism _____
   e. Administration _____

Although listed under "General Data," this question approached the heart of the instrument and gave indication of what is to come. It was deliberately set at the bottom of the sheet to induce the respondent to turn the page. The question was framed out of the experience and reading of the author, and after extensive interviews with other university parish pastors, teachers of religion in higher education, leaders of youth and mature college students of both graduate and under-graduate levels. As previously stated, it was impossible arbitrarily to state that any one of the five functions should be rated above the others.[1] Presumably preaching would be rated first by the respondents (because they are preachers, and because of the central place which has been accorded by tradition to preaching in the evangelistic free churches). Probably counseling would be rated in second place. Admittedly there might be additional functions which ought to be included here, but after extensive deliberation these five functions seemed to the writer to be the outstanding operable functions through which the university parish pastor relates to student life. At any rate, the writer desired to learn how much concurrence he would find as to

---

[1] Above, p. 111.

the order of importance in which pastors thought the functions should be listed.

10. What additional important functions would you list? _____
(Please comment further on reverse side)

That there are other important functions of the university parish pastor relating to students is conceivable and probable, but in order to invite the cooperation of respondents and in order to stimulate their urge to be creative, question 10 was included. The intent of the question was both to elicit important information and to encourage further participation. The writer hoped that many pastors would turn the page over and make creative comment on the reverse side.

B. Plant, Program, and Pastoral Relationships[1]

Page two of the instrument dealt with questions relative to three categories; namely, Plant, Program, and Pastoral Relationships. These were general and statistical questions which were asked to produce data with which other findings could be correlated. A review of these questions is in order.

1. Questions Relating to Plant

1. How far is your church from the campus? _____
   a. If distant, how does this affect student program _____
   (Please comment further on reverse side)

Whether or not this question produced valuable data will be revealed in a later chapter when the total mass of material is analyzed.[2]

2. How adequate are your physical accomodations for a student group? Good _____; fair _____; poor _____

---

[1] See Appendix A, p. 522.

[2] Below, p. 225.

3. Does your student group have a room or center of its own?
Yes _____; No _____

4. Must accomodations be shared with other groups? Yes _____;
No _____
   a. If so, is this plan a success? _____; or a failure? _____
   b. Please describe the sharing agreement (comment on reverse side)

These four questions were combined into a unit or block because they are related. They are not only related to one another, but they are related to the entire effectiveness of the relationship of the pastor and the local church with student life. It has been established that many college churches grew up without any specific regard for the adjacent campus.[1] Thus, because student quarters or facilities were not included in the master-plan of many churches, their contemporary college-age groups are forced to share quarters with other groups. This limits the effectiveness of the university parish pastor's service to students.

By inviting further comment on questions 1a and 4b, the writer hoped that additional creative data might be evoked on the part of respondents.

2. Questions relating to Program

While admittedly much of the program of student work is properly administered through the direction of the Foundation Director or the student worker (providing there is such a person on the staff), the preaching pastor ought to keep his fingers on the pulse of the student program so that he knows what is going on, and so that his proper functions in serving students might remain operative. This block of questions sought to produce pertinent information which might be used for evaluating other problems faced by pastors concerned.

---

[1] Above, p. 144.

1. Do you have difficulty securing suitable adult counselors or advisers for your college age group?
Yes _____; No _____

It is generally agreed by pastors in local churches that the enlistment of suitable counselors or advisers for youth groups is a serious and growing problem. This question was proposed here to determine whether a similar dearth of suitable counselors and advisers obtains at the college level.

2. How are such advisers secured? (a) Student selection _____; (b) Volunteers _____; (c) Local Com. on Education _____; (d) Appointed by pastor _____; (e) Other _____

3. How much training have your present advisers had for student work? Considerable _____; some _____; none _____

4. Would they be willing to attend a 1 week summer training or "lab" school on a Conference or Area scale?
Yes _____; no _____; maybe _____

These three questions are related to one another and to question 1. It is probable that question 2 will elicit more usable information than question 3, but it was felt that the latter query would produce a qualitative response. Question 4 referred to the setting up of a summer training school for advisers on a Conference or Area basis.

5. How are relations between "Town and Gown" groups in your church?
Good _____; fair _____; poor _____

In many ways this inquiry is as important today as it was in past generations. It should be helpful to determine what variation of attitudes there might be in "town and gown" relations as they affect the ministry of the university parish pastor to students.

3. Questions Relating to Pastoral Relationships

A final block of general questions concluded the introductory two-page section of the instrument. They were concerned with specific areas

of the pastor's preparation, training, and experience as they relate to students. The writer thought that some of the information induced by this question might become more valuable when correlated with data collected concerning the operative functions of the university parish pastor.

1. Do you entertain students in your home?
   Considerably _____; some _____; none _____
   a. What value does this entertaining have ? _____
   b. Do you receive financial aid for this? _____
   (Please comment further on reverse side)

Depending on the point of view of the pastor concerned, this question might have indicated considerable potential. Ideally, a certain amount of personal contact with students on the part of a university parish pastor might be considered a good thing, and eating with students is a good way to get acquainted with them. If the pastor's family is willing to entertain students from time to time, it would seem that the local Board of Managers and/or the Campus-Church Relations Committee would consider the matter important enough to include an item in the budget for it. Therefore, question 1 was included.

2. How often do you sit in on your student group meetings?
   (during worship, discussion, planning sessions, etc.)
   Considerably _____; some _____; none _____

These three questions were included in an attempt to discover correlation between the effectiveness of a pastor's work at a university parish church and the number of years he has served such a church and/or the number of near-campus churches he has during his ministry.

Factual answers to this question might give an indication of how closely related the pastor is to student activity. Also, they might reveal an important relationship to his effectiveness in serving students.

3. How many years have you served as a member of an annual Conference? _____

4. Of this time how many years have you served a campus-related church? _____

5. How many campus-related churches have you served? _____

6. What graduate degrees do you hold? Masters _____; B.D. _____ Other_____

7. Have you had formal training for student work? _____ (Please comment on reverse side)

8. Have you attended a summer credit course for university parish pastors as offered at Garrett, Perkins, USC, Candler, etc.? Yes _____; No _____
   a. Would you be willing to attend such a 5 wks. course? Yes _____; No _____

These six inquiries dealt with the degree of training which the pastor concerned has had for his work. This training would include experience and special formal education. Question 8 was aimed at encouraging the enrollment of a number of university parish pastors in such a training program.

C. Page Three: The Preaching Function[1]

The third page of the questionnaire dealt with the first of the five operative functions of the university parish pastor as they relate to students; namely, the function of preaching.

1. Using 1,2,3,4, etc., please rate in order of importance the following types of sermons which you preach to your Sunday a.m. congregations:
   a. Life situation _____
   b. Expository _____
   c. Textual _____
   d. Doctrinal _____
   e. Bible-centered _____
   f. Others (name _____

The above question was aimed at discovering the general types of sermons that are being preached in university situations today. It will

---

[1] See Appendix A, p. 523.

be observed that these categories overlap one another. For example, in no way is this question intended to imply that theological preaching could not nor should not be life-situation preaching. Also, the writer felt that the order of sequence in which the sermon types were listed might reveal important implications. Only a few types of sermons were listed here--thus inviting the suggestion of others by the respondents.

It is only fair to state that this question was freighted with secondary intent. Not only was it aimed at discovering the types of sermons that are being preached and at inviting respondents to add to the list, but the question also endeavored to measure the attitudes of pastors regarding the significance of life-situation preaching. It is agreed that a major thrust of preaching in a university community ought to be directed at man's modern predicament in a disordered world. It is also agreed by many (including the writer) that such preaching ought to be communicable in terms that are relevant to man as he finds himself in such a state. In order to carry out such a program of preaching, the message must echo and re-echo the basic notes of Christian faith in application to life. If the above assumptions are true, then the writer feels that life-situation preaching (among other types) ought to occupy an important place in the pastor's preaching. How important that place is might be determined by data returned in answer to this question.

3. How much direct relationship have you discovered between your preaching and the number of students who seek you out for personal counseling?
   Considerably _____; some _____; none _____

This inquiry implied the correlation of the function of preaching with the function of counseling. It is presumable that the kind of

preaching a pastor does provokes a correlative amount of counseling. This will be considered later.[1]

2. How much do you slant sermons at student life and student problems? Considerably _____; some _____; none _____

4. How often do you use illustrations from campus life in preaching? Considerably _____; some _____; none _____

5. Do you use campus phraseology and "jargon" in your sermons? Considerably _____; some _____; none _____
   a. If so, do students react favorably? _____;
      unfavorably? _____;
   b. Do you have comment to make on this?
      (Use reverse side)

6. Have you found value in "block-preaching" to students on Sunday mornings? (i.e., preaching specifically to students on special days or seasons like Orientation-enrollment week, Homecoming, Student Day, Graduation, etc.)
   Considerably _____; some _____; none _____

7. Or is your preaching continually slanted at an average Sunday morning congregation with only occasional reference to students present?
   Considerably _____; some _____; none _____

These five questions were naturally grouped together and concerned with discovering what attempt, if any, is being made by the university parish pastor to recognize that he has an obligation to preach in ways that are relevant to the needs of students. They are self-explanatory.

8. Do you find students critical of preaching?
   Considerably _____; some _____; none _____

9. How much would a student rather take part in a discussion himself than listen to a formal sermon?
   Considerably _____; some _____; none _____

Comment on question 8 is unnecessary. Question 9 assumed that most students, because of their later-adolescent nature, would rather learn by doing than by sitting still and soaking up truth like a sponge when it is poured over them.

---

[1] Below, p. 272.

10. Is your pulpit open upon occasion to visiting pulpit guests who are "student speakers" or able pulpiteers of some recognition? Yes _____; no _____
a. If so, how many guests preached for you last year? _____
b. Do you have honoraria for them in your budget? Yes _____; no _____

11. How do students react to such speakers? Favorably _____; unfavorably _____; indifferently _____

It is conceivable that students would enjoy some variation in preaching, particularly if good visiting speakers who preach in a manner that is relevant to the mind of the university community were available. Thus, it is assumed that sharing the local pulpit with an outstanding preacher at intervals might be desirable. Whether this is true will be asnwered by returns to this question. Question 11 was related to question 10. At the bottom of page three there was an invitation to "use reverse side for further comment on any of the above questions."

D. Page Four: The Counseling Function[1]

Page four of the questionnaire dealt with the counseling function of the university parish pastor as he relates to students. Questions were posed as follows:

1. Do you believe there is (or should be) a direct relationship between your pulpit preaching and your personal counseling with individual students? Considerable _____; some _____; none _____

It has been suggested previously that probably the pulpit preaching of the ideal university parish pastor ought to be reflected in the amount and quality of his counseling with individual students.[2] Perhaps data received at this point will tend to confirm or deny this statement.

---

[1] See Appendix A, p. 524.

[2] Above, p. 123.

2. Do you publish definite hours when you are available for counseling? Yes _____; no _____

3. About how many hours per week do you spend counseling students?

These two questions dealt with the time spent by the university parish pastor in counseling with students. It is understandable that often the parish pastor appears so engrossed in the routine and "busy-work" of his profession that he gives the impression he can't be bothered by individuals seeking personal counseling. Answers to these questions might become helpful in correcting such an impression.

4. About what percentage of your counseling with students results from your following activities?
   a. Preaching _____
   b. Participating in student activities _____
   c. Personal calling on students _____
   d. Casual encounter _____
   e. Just by being available _____
   f. Other ways (name them) _____

5. In what particular ways do you seek to create counseling situations by establishing intimate personal relations with individual students? _____
   (Please comment further on reverse side)

Question 4 was directly related to question 1. Answers to this inquiry might indicate whether the pastor is really working at an effective counseling program. Probably he will need to have kept some kind of records of his counseling to be able to answer factually.

Question 5 was related to question 4 and refers to the practice of a parish pastor who does not wait like a Roman Catholic cleric for the counselee to seek him out, but who seeks to create counseling situations in his every day pastoral contact with the university community, i.e., by "being around," attending functions, speaking on the campus, etc. Additional comment invited on the reverse side of this page might prove valuable.

6. What method of counseling do you think works best with students? Using 1,2,3, rate one or more of the following in order of best results:
   a. Non-directive or reflective method _____
   b. Giving advice out of your experience _____
   c. Just listening _____
   d. Combination of several methods _____
   e. Some other method? (name it) _____
   (Please use reverse side for further comment)

Question 6 was a methods question which was aimed at revealing how experienced the pastor is in use of contemporary methods of counseling. It should also indicate how much reading he has been doing in the area. The door was left open for creative comment by the respondent. It should be revealing to discover the order of importance in which the methods are rated by respondents.

7. Using 1,2,3,4, etc., please rate in order of importance the following problem areas of student concern:

a. Emotional	_____	f. Economic	_____
b. Vocational	_____	g. Moral & Spiritual	_____
c. Educational	_____	h. Marriage & family	_____
d. Social	_____	i. Alcohol	_____
e. Health	_____	j. Others (name them)	_____

(Please use reverse side for further comment)

Question 7 was designed to give the respondent an opportunity to indicate what he feels are the important problems of student concern and the order in which he feels that they should be named. Categories overlap one another, but they are suggested by competent authorities.[1]

8. Do you refer students who may be in need of professional psychiatric or psychological treatment?
   Considerably _____; some _____; none _____

The university parish pastor should be qualified to refer students who are in need of professional treatment for emotional problems, and question 8 sought to determine how widespread such a practice is.

---

[1] O. Spurgeon English and Gerald H. Pearson, Emotional Problems of Living (New York: W. W. Norton, Inc., 1945), pp. 163-292.

9. Have you had any special training (other than your own reading) which aids you to recognize symptoms indicating a need for professional referral? (i.e., simple and/or pronounced neuroses, psychoses, hysteria, depression, paranoia, etc., and a general knowledge of the emotional problems which are characteristic of later adolescense or college-age youth?)
   Considerable _____; some _____; none _____
   a. If so, what training? (Comment on reverse side)

10. Have you done clinical counseling under supervision?
   Yes _____; no _____
   a. If so, please describe on reverse side.

Questions 9 and 10 are related questions. They implied a need for specialized training on the part of the pastor involved if he would approach the counseling norm projected by the ideal university parish pastor. These questions did not imply that a parish pastor should become a professional psychotherapist or a licensed clinical counselor.

E. Page Five: The Teaching Function[1]

The teaching functions of the university parish pastor as he relates to students were pointed up in this page of questions:

1. Does <u>any</u> parish pastor in your community teach a course(s) in religion for which students receive regular academic credit? Yes _____; no _____
   a. If so, state <u>which</u> pastors are teaching <u>what</u> courses and describe their arrangement with the administration for such teaching _____
   _____
   (Please use reverse side for further comment)

2. Do you teach any kind of a student class or group?
   Yes _____; no _____
   a. If so, what kind of a class or group _____
   _____
   (Please use reverse side for further comment)

Through the use of the above two questions (1 and 2) the writer hoped to survey what is being done by pastors in the area of teaching.

---

[1] See Appendix A, p. 525.

It will be noted that question 1 dealt specifically with classes being taught for regular academic credit. Obviously there would be different requirements in discipline, scholarship, preparation, and credentialing for the teaching of such courses as over and against requirements for teaching a group designated under question 2. The writer felt that answers to question 1 should be thrown open to teaching pastors of all categories for the production of whatever data might be forthcoming. Also, the writer thought that a survey of the kinds of courses being taught might prove valuable. It is reasonable to expect that more teaching is being done by the average university parish pastor under the category referred to in question 2 than by the category indicated in question 1.

3. Does your church provide a "laboratory experience" for training students in churchmanship so that they will be required to make an active contribution to Kingdom work when they return to their home communities?
   Yes _____; no _____

4. Does your local church offer teacher-training courses (or cooperate with a united effort) in which your students participate? Yes _____; no _____

5. How much do your college students participate in the following activities?
   a. Church School teaching Considerably ___; some ___; none ___
   b. Substitute teaching Considerably ___; some ___; none ___
   c. Church School officer Considerably ___; some ___; none ___
   d. Ushering Considerably ___; some ___; none ___
   e. Taking part in Sunday a.m. worship services Considerably ___; some ___; none ___
   f. Other activities (name them) _____
   (Please use reverse side for further comments)

6. How many college students on your Official Board? _____
   a. In what other capacities than president of student group (name them) _____

The importance of establishing a laboratory experience for training college Methodist youth in churchmanship has been established.[1] Questions

[1] Above, p. 85.

3,4,5 and 6 sought to measure what is being done by men on the field to approach the standards set up by the ideal pastor in this area of his ministry to students.

7. How much fundamental knowledge of the principles of Religious Education and Psychology of Religion do you feel is needed by the university parish pastor?
Considerable _____; some _____; none _____

8. How much fundamental knowledge of the dynamics and principles of general progressive education do you feel is needed by the university parish pastor?
Considerable _____; some _____; none _____

Through the use of questions 7 and 8 the writer attempted to discover how well the pastor has kept up in his reading in the areas of education and religious education. It is conceivable that if the pastor had hoped to understand the student mind, the principles of the learning process, the scope of his job as it relates to religion in higher education, and the implications of the provisions made by the Quadrennial Committee of the General Conference established in 1956 for implementing the cause of religion in the university community, he would have furnished much important data in answer to this block of questions.[1]

9. Have you lately had any complaints on legal grounds from any student, faculty member, or community person regarding any religious activity of any kind carried on at the campus of your school? Yes _____; no _____
a. If so, were objections raised several times?
Yes _____; no _____
b. Please describe this complaint _____
_____
(Please comment further on reverse side)

Question 9 was designed to point up handicaps or difficulties which are being experienced on the campuses of state or independent schools where there might be administrative resistance to or a popular

[1]Discipline for 1956, pp. 688-702.

feeling of antagonism against religious activity of any kind because of a misunderstanding or a need for a reinterpretation of the laws of the state regarding such religious activity. It has been demonstrated that usually such laws are more liberal than are commonly supposed,[1] and perhaps the local parish pastor can study into the matter and become a means of synthesizing points of view and a proper understanding of legal rights involved.

F. Page Six: The Evangelism Function[2]

This page of the questionnaire dealt with some of the aspects of the evangelistic function of the university parish pastor as he relates to student life. It was assumed that the matter of church membership for college students, as it relates to the pastor's ministry, might be covered in this portion of the survey.[3] Questions on the page are blocked into five general areas of inquiry, outlined as follows:

---

[1] Above, p. 132.

[2] See Appendix A, p. 526.

[3] In framing this block of questions the writer also assumed that it would be impossible to consider the function of evangelism in the full sense of its complete definition. Only some of the characteristics of the evangelistic function which were observable in human behavior were selected for measurement in this study.

For example, there is a recognized relationship between the exercise of the function of evangelism and the enlisting of church members. But the writer does not intend to imply that evangelism IS the enlistment of church members. By popular tradition in The Methodist Church evangelism has become identified with some forms of personal witnessing by laymen. "Lay-visitation-evangelism" has become mistakenly identified with the larger implications of the term "evangelism." Therefore, when the writer refers to the custom of "lay-visitation" as practiced by some student groups, he would rather call such campus activity "visitation enlistment" than "visitation evangelism."

1. During registration week does your School secure information regarding the religious preference of all students? Yes _____; no _____
   a. Is this information easily available? Yes _____; no _____
   b. Or do churches struggle to get it in time? Yes _____; no _____

2. Do you use the W.S.C.S. student-secretary set-up for follow-up on new Methodist student registration? Yes _____; no _____
   a. Please evaluate the strength and weakness of this plan _____ (Comment on reverse side)

The writer has indicated that the pastor has an obligation to secure a list of Methodist-preference students from university pre-registration records.[1] If such a system for recording religious preference during registration has not been installed in the local university, or if the system needs improvement, it would seem to be the university pastor's obligation to do what he can to facilitate such a registration. The survey of the effectiveness of the work of local student secretaries of the Woman's Society of Christian Service should be revelatory.

3. How much do you encourage students to become members of your church? Considerably _____; some _____; none _____

4. What form of membership affiliation do you encourage for students? a. Full mem. ____; affiliate ____; both ____

Through the use of questions 3 and 4 the writer was attempting to discover answers to the larger question, "Is there relationship between the way a university parish pastor discharges his evangelistic obligation to the university community and the effectiveness with which he enlists students as members in his church, either as full members or in the affiliate relationship?" Also, the writer wanted to discover whether there is correlation between the effectiveness of a university parish

---

[1] Above, p. 142.

pastor's program of student-evangelism and the number of years of his experience and the amount of training he has had. These questions were designed to explore this area.

5. Using 1,2,3, etc., please rate in order of importance the following types of evangelism as suited to college students:
   a. Mass evangelism (revivalism) _____
   b. Lay visitation by students _____
   c. Personal, continuous, all-out witnessing in campus life _____
   d. University Christian Mission _____
   e. "Win-my-Chum" tactics _____
   (Please comment further on reverse side)

6. Which of the following time-emphases do you prefer for evangelism as it relates to students?
   a. Concentrated at special periods _____
   b. Continuous emphasis _____
   c. A combination of a & b _____
   d. Any other emphasis _____

Questions 5 and 6 on methods of campus evangelism were included to discover what the men in the field are doing in this area of their ministry to students. Whether mass evangelism is completely out-dated and whether there is still a place for student-visitation enlistment on the campus will be two of the significant questions answered by findings here. It will be interesting to see whether any new and creative ideas in campus evangelism are being developed.

7. Does your school offer a Religious-Emphasis Week (or some similar religious activity) on your campus annually? Yes _____; no _____

8. How much systematic lay-visitation of students does your group do? Considerable _____; some _____; none _____

9. How much place for "revivalism" is there in student evangelism? Considerable _____; some _____; none _____

10. Do we need a "moral equivalent" for yesteryear's revivalistic and soul-winning witnessing for Christ among students? Yes _____; no _____

11. Do you think the final word has been spoken regarding the method of witnessing or evangelism on the campus?
Yes _____; no _____

Each of the five questions in this block spoke for itself and was calculated to evoke a flurry of response, some or all of which might prove to be measurable data of import.

12. How many foreign students on your campus? _____
    a. From how many countries? _____
    b. Does your local church have any active program besides Sunday worship services and regularly scheduled youth activities including these foreign students? Yes _____; no _____
    c. If so, please describe this program on reverse side.

The final question on this page was directed at what is considered by many authorities to be one of the most strategic forms of campus evangelism demonstrable under the direction of the university parish pastor. The writer presumed that if these foreign youth, who are usually devotees of other major faiths, can see the gospel of Christ witnessed in the life of students in the local church and in their every day vocation, this could become one of the strongest testimonials of the Christian faith. How the pastor stands on the question of integration, as well as whether he is meeting the challenge of a practical application of the social gospel in areas of world-wide concern, may be measured by returns from this query.

C. Page Seven: The Administration Function[1]

The final page of the instrument posed questions relative to the fifth function of the university parish pastor; namely, administration. It sought to elicit a variety of information which could not be classified

---

[1]See Appendix A, p. 527.

under any other category. The thirteen questions were grouped into seven blocks for the production of a mass of valuable data.

1. Does your local church have a Campus-Church Relations Committee as defined in paragraph 1365 of the 1956 Methodist Discipline? Yes _____; no _____
   a. If not, do you have some other form of student-relation committee? Yes _____; no _____

Question 1 sought to survey the setting of the Campus-Church Relations Committee which is required by every Methodist church at a near-campus situation. Opportunity was given to name any other form of "relations" committee which might be used in this capacity, such as a Board of Managers for a Wesley Foundation.

2. Does your group have a participating relationship with the following?
   a. Methodist Student Movement _____
   b. World's Student Christian Federation _____
   c. United Student Christian Council[1] _____
   d. The Conference Board of Education _____
   e. The Inter-Conference Commission on Student Work _____

Cognizant of the fact that religion in higher education has local, regional, national and also international ramifications and allegiances, question 2 surveyed how extensively the student group of the local parish church is identified with the above named student Christian organizations and agencies. That the pastor has a responsibility involved in how his student group relates to these organizations was implied by the writer.

3. Does your student work receive funds from outside the local church budget? Yes _____; no _____
   a. If so, from what source _____
   b. How much is the annual budget of your student group? _____

---

[1]This organization is now known as The National Student Christian Federation.

4. How much responsibility for the financing of your student program falls on your shoulders as pastor?
Considerably _____; some _____; none _____

Since the continuity of a successful student program at a near-campus church entails a number of administrative details, many of these items of management minutia become the responsibility of the preaching pastor. A good student program costs money, and frequently the responsibility for financing such a program falls upon the shoulders of the pastor in charge. This presents a problem, and the writer thought that through answers to question 3 he might discover how the men in the field go about solving it. The writer also thought that it might be profitable to determine how much money is received from sources outside the local church, and exactly what those sources are. Therefore, question 4 was included.

5. How much responsibility for <u>public relations</u> concerning student work falls on your shoulders as pastor?
Considerable _____; some _____; none _____

6. How much do you keep in touch with the Department of College and Religious Life of the Board of Education at Nashville? Considerable ____; some ____; none ____

These two questions were somewhat related in that they dealt with relations of the local group which need to be maintained outside of the local church. A constant educational program must be maintained to acquaint the general public with the underlying philosophy of Christian student work. This program must be carried on throughout the local church, throughout the entire campus community (including faculty, administration, student body, and alumni) and throughout the District, Conference, and Area of Methodism. The necessity for such a program of public relations was implied in the original plan of the General

Conference Commission for the enhancing of Christian higher education on campuses across the nation during the 1956-1960 Quadrennium. The writer has pointed out how the pastor of the local near-campus church is the key man in this entire program.[1]

Question 6 was obviously a "loaded" question. It was directed at finding out how pastors avail themselves of the benefits which some from a close association with the college department of the national Board of Education.

7. Do you have an organization of Methodist Faculty Members?
   Yes _____; no _____

8. Do you have an interdenominational Faculty Christian Fellowship on your campus? Yes _____; no _____

Since the successful functioning of a Methodist Faculty Fellowship and/or a Faculty Christian Fellowship would constitute a strategic way in which to enhance the goals which the General Conference Commission on Christian Higher Education originally established for the 1956-1960 quadrennium, a survey of what was being done in this area might prove rewarding. This inquiry might also become the means of stimulating interest in forming new chapters of these important groups on campuses where they do not now exist. If a list of the pastors who are willing to help organize such groups were sent to the Department of College and Religious Life of the Board of Education, as well as to the national administrative offices of the Faculty Christian Fellowship, a helpful lift for this movement might be effected. Therefore, questions 7 and 8 were included.

---

[1]Above, p. 82.

9. Is there a United Protestant Student group on your campus? Yes _____; no _____
   a. If so, how much do you participate?
   Considerably ____; some ____; none ____

10. Is there an Inter-Faith group (Cath., Prot., Jew) on your campus? Yes _____; no _____
   a. Do you participate?
   Considerably ____; some ____; none ____.

11. How much have you been able to serve as "middleman" in synthesizing religion and the various academic disciplines of higher education on your campus?
   Considerably ____; some ____; none ____

The three questions in this category were intended (1) to survey what is going on in these areas which are significant to religion in higher education, and (2) to stimulate organization of such groups through correlation of data received. Question 11 might have been included under the heading of "teaching" as presented on page five of the questionnaire. Nevertheless, the actual "busy-work" which such a synthesis requires throws the question into an administrative category. This question surveyed one of the growing edges of religion in higher education on the contemporary scene.

12. Should appointment to a university parish pastorate receive consideration by the Bishop and Cabinet as a "special calling?" Yes _____; no _____

13. When a pastor trains for a university parish pastorate and does an acceptable job, should he expect reasonable "security" or status in such a type of appointment under our Methodist system?
   Yes _____; no _____

These two questions were speculative and not intended to speak lightly of the excellent manner in which Bishops and Cabinets carry on the system of appointing preachers to university parish pulpits. The author thought that the men on the field had a right to speak concerning

this matter. Their opinions will be carefully weighed and their confidence will be respected. It is possible that their corporate thinking on this subject will reveal a mass of constructive comment.

The content of the instrument, as well as some of the philosophy and intent which motivated its compilation, having been presented in the foregoing chapter, the writer felt that it was time to examine and analyze the data that were returned by the 224 respondents. Then perhaps it could be determined whether the accomplishments of the pastors who labor at university parish posts are similar or deviant in measuring up to the projected prototype of the ideal university parish pastor. In the next chapter the writer will begin such an examination and analysis.

CHAPTER IX

ANALYSIS OF DATA RECEIVED FROM QUESTIONNAIRE

INSTITUTIONAL AND GENERAL[1]

From the composite results of data returned from page one of the questionnaire it was observed that the typical Methodist parish pastor in the United States serves a church of 975 members. The possibilities are about two to one that he ministers in a parish which is adjacent to a state college or university rather than near a church-related school. It is a six to one probability that he labors near a public institution of higher learning instead of an independent school.

He performs his ministry near a university which enrolls 3,037 full time students, of whom 580 or 19 per cent are registered Methodist enrollees. Of these Methodist-preference students he "reaches" with his ministry an average of eighty-eight vitally and an additional 153 casually. On any given Sunday morning he preaches to 121 students in his congregation. Full members of his parish church who are college students number fifteen, and his roster of affiliate members registers thirty-four names.

The chances are two to one that he will be connected with a Wesley Foundation or Wesley Fellowship as his church relates to student needs. He believes that preaching is the most important single way in which he can serve students, and that personal counseling is his second

---

[1]See Appendix A, p. 521.

important role in meeting the basic needs of students on the contemporary college campus. Other functions of his ministry to students which he considers most important in order of their significance are: teaching, evangelism, and administration.

This much of the picture of the composite Methodist university parich pastor can be obtained from observation of data from page one of the returned questionnaire. This chapter will undertake such an analysis.

A. Institutional and General Data Analyzed

Page one of the instrument dealt with institutional and general data which were considered important to the background and general structure of the dissertation. Statistical data from these returns are reported as follows:

1. Size of Parish Churches Involved

TABLE 7

MEMBERSHIP OF 224 CHURCHES SERVED BY UNIVERSITY PARISH PASTORS IN THE UNITED STATES

Jurisdiction	1 to 500	501 to 1000	1001 to 1500	Over 1500	Total number
Western	10	11	8	6	35
North Central	12	28	9	10	59
Northeastern	15	9	9	3	36
South Central	7	9	9	9	45
Southeastern	28	12	5	4	49
Totals	72	81	40	32	224

One elementary question which is posed at the beginning of such a study concerns the size in membership of the local parish church involved. Is there correlation between the size of the church and the quality and effectiveness of the pastor's student work? Is there sharp contrast or similarity of effectiveness in student programs which can be discovered by correlating the size of church memberships with the size of college enrollments? Also, is it not conceivable that a local church ought to be large enough to be able to employ a trained student worker? In answer to these and other questions respondents replied with the following data as tabulated by jurisdictions in Table 7.

Returns from this portion of the survey demonstrate that the university parish pastor serves more churches under 1,000 in membership than over this number by about two to one. The North Central Jurisdiction has nearly 50 per cent of its near-campus churches bracketed in the 501-1000 range; South Central shows that its churches are about evenly divided among the four classifications; and Western presents almost as uniform a pattern as South Central. The most variation was observable in the Southeastern Jurisdiction, which was the locale of the largest distribution of instruments and the smallest percentage of returns. This area numbers more than one-half of its college-related churches in the smallest category of 1-500. The membership of these 28 smaller churches totals only 9,510, for an average of 340 members per church. From his experience in the field, the writer concludes that a church needs to have a minimum of 500 members to be financially able to employ its own trained leadership for student work. If this is true, pastoral leadership in smaller churches which must meet the needs of a large number of Methodist-preference students presents a particular problem.

As stated, the average membership of the churches covered by this study was 975.[1] This appears to be a membership of sufficient size to support a professional student worker on its staff. If every one of the 224 churches involved came up to the average membership in size, student work across the nation would be able to stand on its own. But, unfortunately, this is not the case.

2. Classification of Institutions Involved

In response to question 2 on page one of the questionnaire, the classification of colleges and universities with which Methodist university parish pastors are related in this study, as visualized in Table 8, becomes clear.

TABLE 8

CLASSIFICATION OF INSTITUTIONS INVOLVED

Jurisdictions	State schools	Methodist related schools	Other denominational schools	Independent schools	Total institutions
Western	26	6	3	0	35
North Central	33	11	10	5	59
Northeastern	21	3	4	8	36
South Central	21	9	2	3	45
Southeastern	34	13	7	5	49
Totals	135	42	26	21	224

Table 8 indicates that when Methodist Bishops appoint pastors to churches involved in this study by the law of averages 60 per cent of them go to parish stiuations adjacent to state colleges or universities,

[1] Above, p. 204.

19 per cent become pastors near Methodist college campuses, 12 per cent are assigned to churches adjoining denominational institutions other than Methodist, and the final 9 per cent are located at parishes neighboring independent schools of higher learning.

The table also indicates that if the pastor resides in the Western Jurisdiction his chances are four to one greater that he will be appointed to a church near a state school rather than to a church adjacent to a Methodist school. If he lives within the broad mid-continent belt composed of the North Central and South Central Jurisdictions his chances for appointment to a state school situation are about three to one in favor over his being assigned to a Methodist college station. If he resides in the Southeastern Jurisdiction his chances for going to a state college situation are about two to one over locating near a Methodist school. And if he lives in the New England or Northeastern areas his chances are seven to one that he will be appointed to a state school location instead of to a Methodist college situation. The latter might be explained by the fact that most New England colleges were founded by Congregational, Baptist, Unitarian, Presbyterian and other denominations then Methodist before the latter began to establish schools in America.[1] It is a matter of history that private colleges dominate the New England higher educational scene and that Methodist colleges have never been strong in this area.

With 60 per cent of the pastors involved in this study being appointed to parish churches near state schools, it behooves these pastors to be aware of state laws and restrictions which may or may not limit the

---

[1]Arnold G. Tewksbury, The Founding of American Colleges and Universities (New York: Teachers College, Columbia University, 1932), pp. 55-ff.

practice and interpretation of religion in higher education in their respective areas. It is time now to examine the enrollment of the colleges and universities with which the university parish pastor is concerned.

3. Institutional Enrollment

Does the size of the college or university served by the local Methodist church have a corresponding relationship to the way in which the parish pastor is able to meet the needs of students? Also, does the size of the school have a direct bearing on the skills, techniques, and equipment which are required to minister to campus needs? In order to find answers to these and related questions it is necessary to review enrollment statistics of the schools implicated in this study as returned in answer to question 3 of page one of the instrument. Such a picture may be gained from observation of Table 9.

TABLE 9

ENROLLMENT STATISTICS OF RELATED SCHOOLS

Juris-diction	1 to 500	501 to 1000	1001 to 2500	2501 to 5000	5001 to 10,000	Over 10,000	Total enroll-ment	Per cent of total
Western	4	5	12	6	6	2	146,283	21.5
North Central	11	12	20	3	7	6	254,579	35.7
North-eastern	6	10	12	7	1	0	68,121	10.0
South Central	6	14	12	6	4	3	116,294	17.0
South-eastern	11	13	17	1	5	2	94,928	14.0
Totals	38	54	73	23	23	13	680,205	100.0

The heaviest concentration of students apparently centers in the North Central area which returned the most questionnaires. More than one-third or 37.5 per cent of the students concerned in this study are located in the nine states that make up this region, and it is significant to note that this jurisdiction has the best balance of all in regard to the number of schools in each statistical division. The next rated jurisdiction in this regard would be South Central. Although the Western Jurisdiction numbers fourteen schools which enroll more than 2,500 students, a majority of the colleges reporting from this area were under 2,500 in enrollment. Both Northeastern and Southwestern have a majority of their schools in or below the middle division. It is meaningful that the Southeastern Jurisdiction, which has the greater number of colleges and universities in the nation with a potential relation to this study, has only eight schools in the 2,500-or-over class in contrast to forty-eight institutions rating as smaller schools. There is correlation between the dominance of smaller schools and the more sparsely distributed and rural population of this area.

Suffice to say that about one-third or 32.5 per cent of the schools involved are in the 1,001-2,500 classification, and approximately three-fourths or 74 per cent of the schools are found in the 2,500-and-under bracket. In other words, this study necessarily draws much of its data from smaller college situations. Therefore, a majority of the Methodist pastors who serve near-campus churches need to gear their methods and techniques to the demands of the smaller university. How long this situation will remain in prospect of the rapidly increasing enrollments of colleges remains to be seen, but for the present this is the picture that is reflected from these data.

4. Methodist-Preference Students and Their Relation to College Enrollments

Having determined the size of the university that the typical Methodist university parish pastor might expect to serve the question is asked, "How many Methodist-preference students may he expect to find on the campus of that university?" The answer to this question is found in tabulated returns of respondents who replied to question 4 on page one of the questionnaire. These date are reported for visual observation in Table 10.

TABLE 10

METHODIST-PREFERENCE STUDENTS AND COLLEGE ENROLLMENTS

Jurisdiction	Meth-pref. students	College enrollment	Percentage of Meth-pref. students
Western	16,788	146,283	11.5
North Central	55,238	254,579	21.7
Northeastern	10,197	68,121	14.9
South Central	25,155	116,294	15.5
Southeastern	22,652	94,928	24.0
Totals	130,030	680,205	19.1

Table 10 reveals an impressive number of Methodist-preference students on the college campuses concerned in this study. The 19.1 ratio is amassed from percentage figures which range from the low of 11.5 in the west to the high of 24 per cent in the southeast. North Central, which registers 37.5 per cent of all the college students in the United States covered by this study, stands second highest in jurisdictional scoring with 21.7 per cent. South Central and Northeastern have nearly equal percentage ratios.

The 11.5 percentage figure tallied in the west appears to confirm the findings of Leiffer who discovered that although Methodists make up only about 2.7 per cent of the population above twelve years of age in three western states, Methodist students make up over 10 per cent of the enrollment of a group of colleges in this area.[1]

If the national percentage of Methodist students found on the contemporary college campus seems high, the observer must remember that the findings of this study come from rather a select group of colleges, which by virtue of having Methodist churches near their campuses have been lifting their number of Methodist-preference students during the past decade. Whether a school is a state college, a Methodist-related school or an institution related to a denomination other than Methodist appears to make considerable difference in the ratio of Methodist-preference students found on the campus.

For example, while the jurisdictional ratio of Methodist-preference students on western campuses is 11.5 per cent, at the University of California with a reported student body of 19,000 the registered number of Methodist-preference students is 1,100. This is a ratio of about 6 per cent. At the other extreme, the ratio at the University of the Pacific, which is a Methodist college with a student body of 1,500 and a Methodist-preference list of 700, figures a sizable 47 per cent.

An example of a California state college with strong student work in Methodist churches adjacent to the campus is cited by San Jose State College. Here the enrollment is approximately 12,000 and a near-

---

[1]Murray H. Leiffer, Methodist Student Work at the Colleges of Arizona, California, and Nevada (Upland, Indiana: A. D. Freese and Sons, 1951), p. 15.

campus Methodist parish pastor reports a Methodist-preference enrollment of 1,200, or a ratio of 10 per cent. Admittedly this is rather high for a state college and probably testifies to strong Methodist student programs carried on in local churches for several years.

This study reveals the average number of Methodist-preference students on campuses within the areas of the separate jurisdictions as follows: Western 479, North Central 937, Northeastern 283, South Central 563, and Southeastern 462. This should indicate to the university parish pastor that Methodist students are prolific on campuses of all types and waiting to be reached.

5. Methodist-preference Students and Their Relation to the Local University Parish Church

Now that concrete data have been supplied establishing the ratio of Methodist-preference students on campuses within the respective jurisdictions, the next questions to be answered are, how many of these Methodist-preference students does the university parish pastor reach vitally and casually, and how many of these students eventually are enrolled as members of the local church either as full members or in the affiliate relationship?

These vital questions which become a kind of a measuring stick with which to estimate the effectiveness of the university parish pastor's ministry to students through the exercise of his pastoral functions, find their answers in response to questions 5 and 6 on page one of the questionnaire. A survey of data returned by respondents in answer to these queries is summarized in Table 11.

TABLE 11

RELATION OF METHODIST-PREFERENCE STUDENTS TO CHURCH

Jurisdiction	Number of Meth-pref. students	Reached by parish pastor			Students on church roll		
		Vitally	Casually	Total	Full	Affil.	Total
Western	16,788	2,162	4,749	6,911	572	1,116	1,688
North Central	55,238	6,609	10,130	16,739	1,055	1,573	2,628
North-eastern	10,197	2,039	2,795	4,834	303	338	641
South Central	25,155	5,182	11,360	16,542	1,060	2,665	3,725
South-eastern	22,652	3,683	5,480	9,163	476	1,965	2,441
Totals	130,030	19,675	34,514	54,189	3,446	7,657	11,123

In relation to Table 11 it will be helpful to visualize what percentage of the potential number of Methodist-preference students are reached by the parish pastor, both vitally and casually. It will also be helpful to bring into sharp focus the percentage of these students who become enrolled in the local parish church as full or affiliate members in ratio to the source of supply. Such information is supplied by Table 12.

The foregoing tables indicate that pastors in the South Central jurisdiction are doing the best job percentagewise in reaching their potential supply of Methodist-preference students--with a ratio of 65.3. Northeastern, which reaches a ratio of 48 per cent of its total potential, ranks second. North Central, which lists 42.5 per cent of the Methodist-preference students in the nation covered by this study, ranks first in total number of students reached by pastors in that category.

TABLE 12

PERCENTAGE OF METHODIST-PREFERENCE STUDENTS REACHED AND ENROLLED BY PARISH CHURCH

Jurisdiction	Per cent of Meth-pref. students reached by parish pastor			Per cent of Meth-pref. students enrolled in parish church		
	Vitally	Casually	Total	Full	Affil.	Total
Western	12.8	28.5	41.3	3.4	6.6	10.0
North Central	12.0	18.3	30.3	1.8	2.9	4.7
Northeastern	20.0	28.0	48.0	3.1	3.3	6.4
South Central	20.2	45.1	65.3	4.1	10.7	14.8
Southeastern	16.2	24.1	40.3	2.1	8.7	10.8

But this area appears to be doing the poorest job percentagewise, with only a 30.3 rating. Southeastern pastors are able to reach more than twice as many students, in proportion, as North Central. Southeastern, with the most college churches in the nation concerned in this study, ranks somewhat below western, with a 40.3 per cent record. Western ranks some 9 per cent better than the lowest-ranking North Central.

The reader should keep in mind that the above figures were compiled from churches with widely differing local situations, some of which are conducive to reaching students in great numbers with comparative ease, while at other situations the opportunity for approaching college students with any non-academic program encounters formidable hurdles. The nature of the college and the peculiar circumstances which affect student life on its particular campus are clearly reflected in the number of students who become available for the local parish pastor to reach vitally or casually. For example, at Iowa City, where the town's chief industry is the college and most students sleep in dormitories or

residences within the city limits, the pastor at the First Methodist Church preaches to a congregation of 1,000 students on Sunday morning. In contrast to this situation a South Central pastor reports, "Ninety per cent of our students are commuters and live off campus," and a Southeastern pastor states, "Ours is a 'suit-case college' with 60 per cent commuting daily and a high percentage of those living in dorms going home on week-ends."

According to Table 12, the "Bible belt" of the south leads the nation in enrollment of student members in the local parish church. South Central, with an enrollment of 14.8 per cent of its potential, ranks first. Southeastern ranks next at 10.8 per cent. Third place is held by Western which registers a straight 10 per cent. Northeastern, with 6.4 per cent, and North Central, with 4.7 per cent, make the poorest showings in this table.

Time and space are too brief to exhaust the possibilities for study which the figures in Tables 11 and 12 imply. For example, the differences and similarities revealed by correlation between the "Vitally" and the "Casually" columns would merit careful analysis in a more detailed study. And a careful scrutiny of the similarities and differences suggested by the "Full" and "Affiliate" membership columns as they relate to one another and to the total ministry of the university parish pastor undoubtedly would bear fruit if there were time to harvest it. These tables may be used again later when the evangelistic function of the parish pastor is evaluated. Also, there may be correlation between the records of pastors who are trained for their work and have labored for a number of years at a university parish post and the records of pastors who

have had limited training and experience in this field. It is possible that similarities and differences would show up in relation to the percentage of students reached and enrolled. This matter will be explored later.

7. Types of Student Religious Organizations

What types of organized religious student groups prevail in the local parish church or in connection with it as it seeks to serve student needs? Table 13, which was compiled from data furnished by respondents in reply to question 6, answers this question.

TABLE 13

TYPES OF STUDENT ORGANIZATIONS IN THE LOCAL PARISH CHURCH

Jurisdiction	Wesley Foundation	Wesley Fellowship	Other	None	Total groups
Western	15	7	3	10	25
North Central	26	14	6	13	46
Northeastern	9	15	5	5	29
South Central	21	8	6	10	35
Southeastern	19	13	5	12	37
Totals	90	57	25	50	172

It is observed that the name "Wesley Foundation" outranks the name of "Wesley Fellowship" as the title used by organized student groups which are related to the local parish church by a little more than two to one. The accuracy of this part of the table is to be questioned, however, since some groups which are not regularly accredited according to the Methodist Discipline and the General Conference Commission on standards for student work call themselves "Wesley Foundation." The Discipline

properly defines a Wesley Foundation as the "organized educational ministry of The Methodist Church at a state or independent college or university."[1]

However, according to Dr. Hiel Bollinger, of the Department of College and University Religious Life of the Board of Education of the Methodist Church, there is nothing in the law that prevents any student group from calling itself a Wesley Foundation and a lot of them do. According to information furnished by Dr. Bollinger the names "Wesley Club" and "Wesley Fellowship" are quite generally used by student groups that are not Wesley Foundations. There is no diciplinary definition of these latter two terms.[2]

It may be significant that 22 per cent of the pastors reported no organized student group of any kind. The latter were evenly distributed throughout the jurisdictions. Under the listing of "Other" types and the names of student religious organizations that are functioning in the local church, the following designations were mentioned: "Wesley Club," four times; "College Church School Class," five times; "Older Youth MYF," eight times; "Christian Fellowship," twice; and the "YMCA or Christian Association," twice. The following types were designated once each: "Methodist Student Foundation," "Interdenominational Fellowship," "Interfaith Group," and "Fellowship for Christian Action."

Twenty-eight pastors indicated that their students were affiliated with the Methodist Student Movement. This is probably not a correct figure. Most student groups throughout Methodism are supposed to be

---

[1]Discipline for 1960, p. 380.

[2]Information received in a personal letter from Dr. H. D. Bollinger, Department of College and University Religious Life of the Board of Education, P.O. Box 871, Nashville, Tennessee, March 17, 1960.

related to the Methodist Student Movement in some way, but evidently this relationship is considered not important enough by many pastors to merit mention.

8. Students Attending Sunday Morning Worship

In reply to question 8, the 224 respondents supplied factual information regarding the average attendance of their college-age groups at the Sunday morning worship hour. These data are summarized in Table 14.

TABLE 14

AVERAGE ATTENDANCE OF STUDENTS AT SUNDAY A.M. WORSHIP

Jurisdiction	Total average weekly attendance	Average attendance per church in area
Western	6,357	65
North Central	8,616	131
Northeastern	2,065	46
South Central	6,435	143
Southeastern	3,659	49
Total	27,132	434

On any given Sunday morning during the school year a total of 27,132 college students gather at 224 Methodist university parish churches across the nation to worship and to hear the sermon by the preaching pastor. This figure comes into sharper focus when it is reduced to the level of the average university parish where it is estimated that 121 students assemble each Sabbath at the Sunday morning worship hour.

This figure becomes more meaningful when its implications are translated relative to the provision of seating space and physical facilities for serving this large group from whom little financial support may be expected. For example, 68 per cent of the churches covered in this study have a membership of less than 1,000 members. Granting that they all had 1,000 members on their rolls, by the law of averages on any given Sunday morning not more than half of them would be present for worship. Thus, the student group in the average university parish will add at least 25 per cent in numbers to the worshipping congregation. This presents a serious problem which cannot be treated in this dissertation, but the university parish pastor should be aware of it.

South Central Jurisdiction which reaches the highest percentage of students through pastoral ministry, leads in total average weekly attendance among the jurisdictions. Fewest students are found in Northeastern and Southeastern parish churches on Sunday morning, with Western outranking them both in attendance. Average attendance at the Sunday preaching hour varies considerably in the individual churches. The smallest number, seven, was reported by a church of less than 200 members adjacent to a rural Agriculture and Mechanical College in the South Central Jurisdiction; whereas the parish pastor of the First Methodist Church of Iowa City (North Central) preaches regularly to 1,000 students on Sunday morning. Undoubtedly the large number of students in the latter congregation includes many "non-Methodist" students who are not listed among the Methodist-preference registrations. This situation poses an additional problem in churches of a similar nature.

9. The University Parish Pastor's Functions

The concluding block of questions on page one dealt with the importance of the five recognized functions of the university parish pastor as he relates to student life. Respondents were asked to rate these functions in order of their importance, and then they were asked to list additional functions that they considered of importance.

Fifty-two respondents agreed 100 per cent with the order of the writer's listing of the five peculiar functions of the university parish pastor as he ministers to students; namely, preaching, counseling, teaching, evangelism, and administration. Among the 224 pastors who answered this question, 155 pastors indicated that preaching was the most important of the five p storal functions; 114 declared that counseling is the second most important function; eight-five chose teaching as their third choice; 110 preferred evangelism as their fourth choice; and 129 thought administration ranked fifth in importance.

Nearly four times as many pastors evaluated preaching above counseling in their choice for first place among these two functions. This ratio extends uniformly through all jurisdictions. South Central rated first with registration of an 84 per cent preference; Western rated next with 82 per cent; North Central tied Southeastern with 79 per cent; and Northeastern pastors voted 76 per cent in favor of preaching over counseling as their first choice.

In tabulating this evaluation by respondents, the writer points out that each pastor had only five choices, and that these choices had to be considered in import of their total value as well as in relation to one another. For example, many pastors would rate evangelism high in comparison

with preaching, counseling, and teaching. But if they had used up their first three choices by naming preaching, counseling and teaching, then their rating of evangelism would have to fall into the category of fourth place--whereas they might really evaluate the function of evangelism on a par with the function of teaching.

While there appeared to be uniformity in the pattern established by this procedure of choosing, there seemed to be a strong feeling on the part of the majority that these five functions were probably the most important of the total functions of the university parish pastor as he ministers to students. There also appeared to be a prevailing attitude that all five of the functions should be included in this study, regardless of the order in which they were named.

A total of thirty-seven pastors judged that counseling was a more important tool in the ministry of the university parish pastor to students than preaching; nine declared that the teaching function rated higher than preaching or counseling; nine thought that administration should rank first; and four figured that evangelism was the most important function. One pastor from the South Central jurisdiction who ranked evangelism ahead of counseling reported that he sends many of his students to the Wesley Foundation Director for counseling and that he also has the services of good Christian psychiatrists for referral. "Otherwise," he comments, "if we did not have these resources, counseling would rate above evangelism."

In answer to the author's invitation to suggest additional legitimate functions of the university parish pastor which should be recognized in this study, there were a number of comments. Some of these responses contribute creatively and merit mention.

At least three pastors agreed that the parish preacher ought to be ably skilled in the art of leading in worship, teaching others to worship, and being able to share in worship participation. This important contribution emphasizes the fact that even in the most non-liturgical churches skill in the conducting of worship is increasingly demanded of the pastor. Furthermore, the omission of this category from the check list is an indication that Methodists have mistakenly subordinated the art of worship to preaching.

Two respondents said that an important function of the pastor should be cooperating with the student worker and correlating his ministry with the program of the local foundation or student group.

"The Function of Fellowship" is described by another as being essential. He comments, "There is a unique rapport that belongs between minister and student which must be kept alive in the minister and communicated." He concludes, "The students are aware of this, and although they may not come to church or even see the minister, they know about it--and the possibility of their communicating remains alive."

Another respondent adds what he calls "the priestly functions: sacraments and worship, and pastoral calling on students who are sick, in the infirmary, with family troubles, at time of death, etc. [sic]." He suggests that a large corps of married students especially need this arm of the parish pastor's ministry. A western pastor pleas for an emphasis on "the pastoral function." "Friendly visitation" is stressed by another as a desirable ministerial function by the pastor who serves students.

B. Summary

In review of data amassed in reply to questions on page one of

the instrument, the observer is impressed with the completeness of the answers and with the spirit of cooperation which respondents indicated in filling out the questionnaires. It appears that much factual, new, and valuable information has been produced, which, if it is carefully analyzed and correlated, may contribute much to this study. Some of the material will not be usable, but one has the knowledge that it is "there" if and when needed. The first lines of the portrait of a typical or average university parish pastor who labors on the field were sketched. Data presented in this fashion give the pastor at the university parish church a glimpse of the enormity of his task. With 60 per cent of all Methodist-preference students registered at state institutions (and this number growing), the wisdom of "following" our students to all types of campuses for the past decade appears to be returning profitable dividends. The high rate of Methodist-preference students in ratio to college enrollments is astounding, and the large number of students who are available to the ministry of the university parish pastor is amazing.

The tremendous responsibility that goes with a local church's responding to the needs of students with a cooperative and sharing program that requires heavy financial outlay with no prospect of material returns presents a challenge. Many local churches are accepting this challenge. The report of the large number of students who are being reached by some pastors forms a rewarding discovery. The story of their untiring evangelistic effort is documented by these data. But there are other indications which suggest that if the pastor is going to become the "ideal" parish minister to students he must make considerable improvement.

It is time now to examine data returned from page two of the instrument. This will be done in the next chapter.

CHAPTER X

ANALYSIS OF QUESTIONNAIRE CONTINUED PASTORAL RELATIONSHIPS, PLANT AND PROGRAM[1]

Additional strokes of the statistical brush which bring details of the picture of the typical Methodist university parish pastor into bolder relief are furnished by data returned from respondents in answer to page two of the questionnaire which deals with general background factors regarding the plant and the program of the local parish church, as well as with factors concerning the pastor's relationship to his job.

In addition to characteristics established in Chapter IX, this chapter will reveal that the typical or average pastor who features this study has served 18.07 years as a preacher in the Methodist ranks, averaging 6.8 years as a pastor in a college situation. He is forty-five years old. The possibilities are about three to one that he has never served a university parish church before, and if past appointive trends continue it is not likely that he will be appointed to another. He holds the equivalent of a Bachelor of Divinity degree and has only one chance in four of having earned higher academic ranking. There is a 20 per cent probability of his using the title "Doctor," but there is only a 10 per cent chance of his having earned this distinction through academic achievement.

By the law of averages he has had little formal training for exercising the peculiar functions of his ministry as they relate to

---

[1]See Appendix A, p. 522.

students, but he would be eager to attend a five weeks laboratory school set up on a regional or national scale for explicit training in his job, providing he could get time off and some financial subsidy for such training.

He serves a church that is 6.9 blocks away from the college or university campus to which he relates. This distance factor presents a minor problem which affects his ministry to students, but it does not appear to be unsolvable. The student group he serves probably has to share its meeting place and physical accommodations with other organizations of the local church. This presents a problem.

The probabilities are three to two that he does not have serious difficulty in securing suitable adult lay counselors or advisers for his student group. Usually he selects his advisers by personal appointment, after consultation with the Commission on Education of the local church and with the consent and/or choice of the student group. A majority of his lay student counselors have had limited training for their jobs, and 90 per cent of them would consider additional formal training if it were offered. Usually the "town and gown" elements of his church enjoy a good relationship.

Most pastors entertain students to some degree in their homes, considering it has value. Only one in four receives financial aid for this enterprise. Most pastors frequently sit in on student-group sessions. A more detailed analysis of data returned on page two of the instrument follows. The chapter will be divided into three divisions: (1) pastoral relationships, (2) plant and physical accommodations, and (3) program.

A. Pastoral Relationships

Some important relationships of the university parish pastor as they affect his ministry to students will be summarized in this section under the following headings: (1) record of pastoral service, (2) formal educational qualifications, (3) specialized training, and (4) entertaining students in the pastor's home.

1. Pastoral Service Record

The university parish pastor's record of total years service as a Methodist minister as related to the number of years he has spent in a college or university situation is illustrated by Table 15.

TABLE 15

ANALYSIS OF SERVICE RECORDS

Jurisdiction	Total years served as Conf. members	Average years served per pastor	Total years in college situation	Average years at situation
Western	601	17.2	218	6.0
North Central	1,147	19.3	403	6.8
Northeastern	519	14.4	241	6.7
South Central	863	19.2	258	5.5
Southeastern	918	19.0	290	6.0
Total averages	4,048	18.07	1,410	6.2

Analysis of data revealed that the average university parish pastor has served 18.07 years as a Methodist minister. This factor represents a degree of maturity on the part of this pastor. Because the age of a pastor was not judged to be as important as his training and experience,

and because some men convert their credentials to Methodist orders after several years spent in another denomination, the age factor was not included in the questionnaire. However, the age of the typical pastor may be computed with some degree of accuracy by using the following logic. If a candidate for the Bachelor of Divinity degree is graduated from seminary at about the age of twenty-five, allowing an additional two years for fulfilling Conference requirements and perhaps a few months for additional graduate study, he would normally begin his official ministerial relationship with the Methodist Church at about the age of twenty-seven. By adding his eighteen years of service to this figure his possible age of forty-five is established.

According to Table 15, there is a five-year span between the average lengths of ministerial tenure of the various jurisdictions. North Central, South Central and Southeastern rank about equal in this regard--with Western ranking about two years below the leaders. Northeastern ranks five years below the top three jurisdictions.

There is less appreciable variance discernable in the average number of years each pastor has spent at a college situation. North Central and Northeastern share the top percentile at 6.8 and 6.7 years, respectively, while Western and Southeastern are tied at six years. South Central ranks lowest of the jurisdictions with an average of 5.5 years.

Considering the maturity and experience of the men appointed to university pulpits, it is reasonable to presume that usually they should be among the abler and more stable preachers of their respective conferences. In comparison to data furnished by Seymour A. Smith in a nationwide study of American college chaplains, the typical university parish

pastor is about five years older than the composite college chaplain who serves in American institutions of higher learning.[1] And in comparison to data discovered by R. H. Edwin Espy as a result of a study of 440 college teachers who serve on the faculties of church-related schools throughout the nation, the typical pastor has been preaching nearly twice as long as the composite teacher has been laboring at his job.[2]

In answer to the poll concerning the number of campus-related churches the various respondents have held during their ministry to students, Table 16 displays the corporate findings.

TABLE 16

NUMBER OF CAMPUS-RELATED CHURCHES SERVED BY RESPONDENTS

Jurisdiction	One	Two	Three	Four	Five
Western	24	8	3	1	0
North Central	45	10	3	0	0
Northeastern	30	4	2	0	0
South Central	31	2	2	1	1
Southeastern	32	12	3	2	0
Totals	162	44	12	5	1

Statistics here reveal that 162 or 72.3 per cent of the total number of pastors canvassed have never held a university pulpit previously. Of the remaining sixty-two who have held more than one near-campus

---

[1] Seymour Smith, The American College Chaplaincy (New York: Association Press, 1954), p. 121.

[2] R. H. Edwin Espy, The Religion of College Teachers (New York: Association Press, 1951), p. 28.

pastorate, forty-four or 19.1 per cent have served two such parishes; twelve or 5.4 per cent have held four similar stations; and a single pastor stated that he had served a succession of five such pulpits for a percentage of .45. According to these findings, the chances of the average pastor among this group for being appointed to a second university parish following release from his present church are 162 to 62, or a ratio of about five to two against him.

2. Formal Educational Qualifications

It could be assumed that one criterion by which a university parish pastor's competence for acceptable functioning in a college or university parish community may be measured is the amount of his formal academic training and his years of experience. The degree of scholastic preparation that the 224 pastors of this study have attained may be illustrated most aptly through observation of Table 17.

TABLE 17

ACADEMIC DEGREES OF PASTORS INVOLVED

Jurisdiction	B.D. or equivalent	M.A.	Th. M.	Th. D. or Ph. D.	D.D.	Total earned degrees additional to B.D.	Per cent of total group
Western	35	7	1	2	3	10	17.0
North Central	59	14	2	4	10	20	34.0
North-eastern	36	3	1	7	5	11	18.4
South Central	45	6	1	2	5	9	15.3
South-eastern	48	7	0	2	3	9	15.3
Totals	223	37	5	17	26	59	100.0

Scrutiny of the above figures shows that the typical university parish pastor has a Bachelor of Divinity degree or its equivalent in fulfillment of the minimum academic preparation expected for his job. Only one of the entire 224 pastors surveyed admitted to not possessing the Bachelor of Divinity degree. While this is a minimum educational requirement expected of Methodist preachers who affiliate with most Annual Conferences, admittedly some of the older men did not face this demand when they were credentialed in the past. One pastor in the latter category has satisfactorily bridged the gap in his lack of academic preparation by developing complementary skills. He has preached for twenty-four years, served two near-campus churches, and currently reaches 12.6 per cent of the total enrollment of his neighboring small college.

Graduate degrees above the Bachelor of Divinity are the exception rather than the rule with college community preaching pastors. They are not as likely to have earned advanced degrees up to and including the doctorate as college teachers or college chaplains, according to comparative figures furnished by R. H. Edwin Espy and Seymour A. Smith, who conducted surveys among members of these respective professions. Espy found that 35 per cent of the college teachers held earned doctoral credentials,[1] whereas Smith discovered that 25 per cent of the chaplains held the Ph. D. degree.[2] Only 7.6 per cent of the university parish pastors surveyed hold earned doctorates. An additional twenty-six honorary Doctor of Divinity awards scattered through the five jurisdictions bring the total number of men in this study who are legitimately entitled to use the doctoral

---

[1] Ibid., p. 25.

[2] Smith, op. cit., p. 125.

designation to forty-three or 19.2 per cent of the group. The survey does not indicate whether the thirty-seven Masters degrees were earned before or after the Bachelor of Divinity degree was attained.

Seven doctoral degrees are held by pastors in the Northeastern Jurisdiction, which is the scene of the smallest number of collaborators in this study. First place in the total number of earned academic honors above the Bachelor of Divinity degree goes to the North Central Jurisdiction, with 34 per cent. This ratio was found to be nearly twice as high as that of all the other four jurisdictions which, incidentally, are grouped within a span of three percentage points of one another.

This table also shows that there were a total of fifty-nine earned degrees held above the A.B. level and not including the B.D. for a percentage of 26.3. Percentage of those holding earned degrees above the ranking of M.A. and B.D. was 9.8. And all degrees, earned and unearned, above the rank of A.B. and not including the B.D. totaled eighty-five, or 59.4 per cent.

It is significant that double the percentage of graduate degrees above the B.D. have been granted to pastors in the North Central Jurisdiction in comparison to the number of graduate degrees above the B.D. that have been won by pastors of other Jurisdictions throughout the nation, but reasons for this revelation cannot be documented by these data. The close proximity of the larger number of college-pastors in the North Central area to the natural geographic center of population and graduate institutions of higher learning could be correlative. It may or may not be a coincidence that the high percentage of pastors in this area who responded to the survey corresponds to a similar high proportion of respondents from this

section to Dr. Espy's study on the religion of college teachers. He says,

> The location in the Midwest of the preponderance of institutions attended for graduate study is probably to be expected. Their central geographical position for the country as a whole . . . might account for this concentration.[1]

3. Specialized Training for Student Work

In answer to question 7 and 8, relative to formal specialized training for student work, data were tabulated and visually portrayed in Table 18.

TABLE 18

FORMAL COURSES IN STUDENT WORK

Jurisdiction	Formal specialized training of any kind		Summer courses for Methodist university parish pastors	
	Number attending	Percentage of jurisdiction	Number attending	Percentage of jurisdiction
Western	6	17.1	1	2.9
North Central	8	13.1	5	8.5
Northeastern	4	11.1	1	2.8
South Central	9	20.0	6	13.3
Southeastern	6	12.3	4	8.2
Totals	33	14.7[a]	17	7.6[a]

[a]Percentage of grand total

A total of 14.7 per cent of the entire group of pastors surveyed in this study stated that they had received some kind of formal training which would aid them in relating to students. The heaviest percentage of these was concentrated in the South Central area, with North Central scoring second in number but third in percentage. Western ranked above all others except South Central in percentage. The lowest number was tallied by

[1]Espy, op. cit., p. 27.

Northeastern. One respondent stated that he had received clinical training as a chaplain intern at a state hospital and that he had eighteen months experience in managing a personnel agency.

Question 7, which polled attendance at one of the summer credit courses for the training of university parish pastors, provoked a variation of statistical returns and a flurry of comment which will be annotated. Seventeen pastors indicated that they had attended such courses, representing 7.6 per cent of the total number of respondents. South Central and North Central lead numerically and percentagewise in these returns, as they did in returns indicating formal training. It is significant that the larger number of pastors attending such courses are among those who live closer to a concentration of schools offering them.

This table points up the dearth of specialized or formal training in student work of any or all types by the university parish pastor in preparation for his ministry to students. This lack of preparation may be emphasized by expressing it conversely; i.e., that 85.3 per cent of all university parish pastors in the nation who are on the job at present have had no formal or specialized training for student work, and that 92.4 per cent of these pastors have never attended the summer graduate courses annually provided especially for their training.

In order to bring the analysis of this section into clear perspective, returns from question 8a must be tabulated in relation to the foregoing figures. This visualizes the number of pastors who said that they would be willing to take such a five weeks summer course if they had the opportunity, as illustrated in Table 19.

TABLE 19

PASTORS WILLING TO TAKE TRAINING

Jurisdiction	Number willing to take summer course	Percentage of total affirmative answers
Western	20	15.7
North Central	32	25.3
Northeastern	15	11.8
South Central	30	23.6
Southeastern	30	23.6
Totals	127	100.0

North Central supplies one-fourth of the pastors who appear eager to get added training for their jobs. South Central and Southeastern are not far behind. Northeastern's evident reluctance to launch out in this venture is matched by scanty response to this study and by apparent reticence to cooperate in other areas of sampling. With pastors of the Western Jurisdiction residing farthest away from the geographical center of schools offering the special summer courses, this area ranks next to the lowest in willingness to attend.

It is important to note at this juncture that seventy-eight returned a "No" answer to this question, while nineteen made no comment one way or the other. It would seem that the "no comments" would have to be tabulated as the equivalent of "no," which makes the negative response total ninety-seven. This still leaves a substantial majority, however, who are willing to take additional training for their jobs.

There were thirty comments written on the reverse side of the questionnaire in reply to question 8a of part IV. A sampling of these

comments may indicate why there were not more men willing to get additional vocational training for their jobs. They ranged from flat refusals to qualified willingness to attend if time and financial problems could be solved. One Northeastern pastor sharply replied, "No! The problem is not in this direction at all!" but he was a minority of one in reflecting such an attitude. Another pastor from the same area, who has been ordained for twenty-seven years and had spent seven years at a single campus related church, replied, "No! I've gone to school and been talked at enough!" And a third man with a Ph. D. degree from the same area, who has been awarded four academic degrees beyond the Bachelor of Divinity degree, has been a pastor in the effective relationship for thirty-five years and has served thirteen years in three college appointments, says, "Probably not." Such answers by men approaching retirement age give an observer the general impression that beyond a certain age the older a university parish pastor becomes the more reluctant he appears to venture out into untried areas which requires imaginative vision, creative enterprise, and the consuming of energy.

Fourteen respondents said that they could not attend the special courses because of the time element involved. "I simply could not leave all my other parish work for this length of time," says one brother who echoes the reply of this group. Another states, "My vacation must be geared to between semesters. Most colleges have a summer church attendance nearly as large as the winter's."

Finances are a formidable hurdle for at least nine respondents who echoed in varying chorus the sentiment of a western pastor who expressed himself in this wise, "If I could finance it--there ought to be some kind of subsidy for this."

Characteristic of the replies of another minority is the frank answer of the North Central pastor who said, "No, because my next appointment would not be to a university church"; and the Southeastern pastor who replied, "I would if I could, but it seems that no consideration is given much in appointing pastors for this or any other special work"; and the Northeastern pastor who confided, "Yes, if the conference still wants to use me in such a situation."

Here we see an indication of the natural reluctance on the part of a number of pastors to spend the time, money, and the creative energy necessary to secure additional graduate vocational training because of the prospect of limited tenure.

4. Entertaining Students in Pastor's Home

In order to determine whether personal relations with students are enhanced when the pastor at a college parish entertains them in his home, the following data were tabulated from Part IV, question 1, page two of the instrument. Seventy-one per cent of the pastors stated that they sometimes entertained students in their homes. Eighteen per cent revealed that they did considerable entertaining, and 9 per cent confessed that they did not practice this custom. The custom is practiced about equally in all jurisdictions.

There were 117 personal reactions as to the value of such entertaining. They ranged from a flat, "No," and, "Very little," to "inestimable." One stated, "It helps me to know and understand students better; also it opens up occasions for counseling later on." On the negative side, a North Central preacher said that he felt he could accomplish little because when he gave an invitation too many students came at

one time to effect beneficial results. Another pastor who takes a discouraging view of the practice confides, "I have had many such groups for dinner or a social occasion, but usually they seem anxious to get away. Perhaps personality reasons . . ."

By overwhelming majority, however, most written comments were favorable. An enthusiastic devotee's reply is noted in toto:

> It gives me a chance to get better acquainted with the students and also gives them a better chance to know my family. Most of them will be getting married in the near future. They are looking to plan what their homes will be like. We have two small children and the students are interested in small children and how they will rear theirs. It also provides a chance for students to feel at home. They come and go often. We have a spare room, kitchen and bath they can use any time.

Replies representative of this group include the following notations: "Creates a sense of belonging," "better communication," "deepens personal relationships," "strengthens student program," and "opportunity for counseling." Some pastors use this method to considerable profit in orienting foreign students. Such entertainment takes variation in form--usually a meal or snack or some sort of a simple sociable affair. One pastor has open house on Sunday evening following Foundation meeting when a small group drops in at the parsonage for popcorn and toasting marshmellows. A North Central pastor often includes informal discussion, with an occasional speaker invited. Another cooks a simple Sunday breakfast and follows it with the college-age church school lesson. One imaginative preacher divides the incoming new students into four groups at the beginning of each semester and invites one group to his home each Sunday night for a month. His objective is the acquaintance of the students with his family and the acceptance of every student by a friendly group.

In the Western area at least one college-age group meets at the parsonage for coffee and rolls on Sunday morning to watch "Talk-back" on television.

That this practice merits some kind of financial subsidy is the emphatic opinion of 110 respondents; with fifty-three indicating it has some merit; and seven none. Fifty-four made no comment at this point. About one in four pastors had some kind of financial assistance in this project, but such aid is usually meager. There is no particular organization, promotion, or method of solicitation for this activity. In some cases there is a limited amount in the local church budget. One pastor receives $50 a year from the annual Conference; an understanding Woman's Society aids another; but usually the pastor foots the bill.

5. Pastor's Participation in Student Meetings

In reply to the question polling pastors on how often they sit in on student group meetings, i.e., worship, planning and discussion sessions, 92 per cent of the pastors across the nation indicated that they follow this practice, about half of them attending often and the other half of them attending occasionally.

B. Plant and Physical Accommodations

In polling pastors as to whether they thought that there was appreciable correlation between physical accommodations offered by their church plants and the effectiveness of their service to students, it seemed important to discover how far away the churches were from the respective campuses. It also seemed important to discover what arrangements were being made in local churches where student groups find it necessary to share accommodations with other groups. This information will now be tabulated.

1. Distance of Local Church from Campus

TABLE 20

TABULATION OF DISTANCE FACTOR

Jurisdiction	Adjacent or on campus	1-2 blocks	3-6 blocks	7 blocks -1 mile	Over 1 mile to 2 miles	Over 2 miles to 5 miles	Over 5 miles
Western	6	6	10	11	4	0	1
North Central	9	12	20	15	3	0	0
North-eastern	5	10	11	7	2	2	0
South Central	9	6	9	10	7	2	1
South-eastern	10	13	17	2	7	1	0
Totals	38	47	67	45	23	5	2

The distances of schools from the near-campus parish churches are visualized in Table 20 which is arranged by jurisdictions. Because a few pastors relate to more than one college, a total of 227 institutions comprise the universe of this table. Five churches were reported "on campus," and an additional thirty-eight churches were located adjacent to the campus. Thus, 16.7 per cent of the pastors claimed that distance from the campus was no problem for them. The remainder of the pastors reported a distance factor that ranged from one city block to ten miles. Churches reporting a distance factor of one to two city blocks totaled 20.6 per cent. Churches three to six blocks away totaled 29.7 per cent. Churches from seven blocks up to one mile distant totaled 18.8 per cent. Churches that were between one and two miles away totaled 2.2 per cent. And

churches that were more than five miles away from the campus totaled .9 per cent.

Counting twelve city blocks to a mile, the 227 schools were located a grand total of 1,768 city blocks away from their respective home bases, for a national average of 7.74 city blocks per church. South Central's churches were farthest removed from campuses with an average distance factor of one mile; Western's churches were ten blocks distant; Northeastern's were 7.4 blocks away; and Southeastern and North Central registered the nearest proximity with 5.6 and 5.4 city blocks, respectively. It is important to note, however, that figures in Western and South Central jurisdictions admittedly are thrown askew because each area reported one campus ten miles distant from the related parish church. If these two schools are not counted, the national average would be pared down to 6.9 city blocks, which for the purpose and intent of this study is a more realistic figure.

Only 149 pastors, or 66 per cent of the total number of respondents, made additional written comment regarding the distance factor. Three pastors stated that the distance factor was an aid. Thirty pastors said that it neither helped nor hindered. But there were forty-two pastors who insisted that the distance factor was assuredly harmful in their situations, not only as a hindrance to the pastor's relations with students, but as a handicap to the entire student program of the local church. The predicament of the latter group is illustrated by the comment of a Western pastor whose church is located one mile from the campus. His remarks are noted in detail:

> We are actually very handicapped in doing any kind of effective student work. We are almost never invited to campus functions such as chapel (certainly not as speakers), MSM meetings, etc. If we organize a car pool a fair number will come to church on Sunday. When the school is so far away there is no way to get acquainted with students. When I see students only at church we never get acquainted at all. Students are busy people who do not like going off-campus on week nights. My chief loss is in a feeling of separation from student life. I know no way to bridge it.

A Southeastern pastor whose church is two miles distant from the Campus says, "The Church is placed outside the orbit of student life." This sentiment is echoed by a Northeastern respondent who scribbles, "It makes the Church an out-of-bounds situation." Another Northeasterner who is nine blocks away says that distance is a problem limiting student-work to Sundays only. A Southeastern respondent who labors three miles away from his campus laments, "Students must pass four other Methodist churches to get to our church." Another from the same area reports that even though members pick up students at stated places every Sunday, often they are late which complicates the duties of the active members. A North Central pastor reports that being one mile away has little perceptable effect on the Sunday program but that it makes a seven-day schedule of student work impossible.

The distance factor appears to be a problem, but many respondents are working hard to discount it. Several churches have secured busses, students cooperate in car-pools, and friendly members of the congregation who live in the area of the campus pick up church school teachers and worshippers among the campus crowd for transportation to church on Sundays. A sizable number have eased this difficulty by purchasing or establishing quarters for a student center on or adjacent to the campus.

On the whole, a majority of the pastors concerned do not consider the distance factor completely unsolvable. One optimist who refuses to turn up the dark side of the coin confides, "It keeps our group small but CHOICE!"

2. Sharing Accommodations With Student Groups

About half the pastors indicated that their student groups have at least a room which it can call its own, but 142 or 63 per cent had to share some of the facilities of the local church with other organizations. This raised the possibilities of friction. About 100 pastors revealed that although this situation involved elements of potential tension the handica could be overcome by the application of the golden rule. An equal number failed to comment on this matter, but a total of thirty-three voiced vociferous complaints, stating that such arrangements for sharing were failures. Objections range from, "nearly fatal," to "discouraging failure."

In describing the problems arising from shared facilities, respondents revealed that a major source of tension appears to center around corporate use of the kitchen by students and the Woman's Society of Christian Service or by students and members of the Methodist Youth Fellowship and other youth groups in the church. That smaller churches with limited facilities are extremely handicapped by this problem is the testimony of a Western pastor who writes:

> We have inadequate facilities for the church itself without the students . . . We have three large groups on Sunday evening and they are crowded. They have to meet in the parsonage because space is not available at the church.

A concluding example of a pastor who has succeeded in working out a satisfactory sharing agreement between student groups and other organizations of the local church is provided by another pastor of the Western jurisdiction whose statement merits quoting in full:

> Wesley's facilities contain offices, kitchen, dining room, several classrooms, lounge and assistant director's apartment. The W.S.C.S. uses its facilities for regular meetings, money raising, etc. The Church School holds two sessions there on Sunday morning, using all rooms excepting lounge and office.
>
> The church pays part of janitor's salary, utilities and operating costs. Secretarial help is shared. Group ownership of office facilities is determined, but both groups use one anothers'. So far as possible the center is reserved for Wesley every afternoon from 4 p.m., all day Saturday, and Sunday afternoon and evening. The appeal is made that we function as a "Church family." The two-way reciprocal interest of both local church and students has been considerably increased through such relationships.

C. Program

The tabulation of data concerning these two important phases of the pastor's relations to students as they relate to program will be surveyed next: securing advisers, and "town and gown" relations.

1. Securing and Training Suitable Advisers

Obtaining acceptable adult counselors for college age groups does not appear to be as critical a problem in the near-campus church as the securing of youth advisers in the non-campus related parish. A total of 126 pastors indicated that this matter presented no special problem. To this figure must be added nine pastors who made no comment for a sum of 60 per cent who experienced no difficulty in recruitment. A minority of 40 per cent who did report some difficulty in securing acceptable counselors is too large a segment to ignore, but respondents in this category did not state why they had trouble in this area.

The 60 per cent who declared that they had no problem securing adult advisers report a variety of methods used in selecting them. Some employed a single method and others used a combination of procedures. Making allowance for considerable overlapping, the following synthesis of methods was determined as illustrated in Table 21.

TABLE 21

HOW ADVISERS WERE SELECTED

Method of selection	Number	Per cent of total
Appointed by pastor	59	26.6
Appointed by Com. on Education	49	21.9
Elected by Students	39	17.6
Volunteers	18	8.4
Other methods	37	16.5
No comment	22	9.8
Totals	224	100.0

In due regard for use of the democratic process by the pastor, it must be pointed out that the local Commission on Education was usually consulted and that the student group concurred in the selection of the adviser before final confirmation of the appointment. Data show that heavy responsibility is born by the pastor in making such decisions.

The category of "other methods" of selecting advisers is sufficiently large to warrant exploration and reveals the following tactics pursued: several were chosen by the Wesley Foundation Board of Directors; several were chosen by the Church-Campus Relations Committee; and several were appointed by the Director of the Wesley Foundation, the Methodist

Faculty Fellowship, the Woman's Society of Christian Service, the Director of Religious activities on the campus, the college chaplain, the Commission on Religion and Life, or the Quarterly Conference. A New England church hires seminary students for counselors. In several churches the professional director of student work or the Foundation worker serves as adviser. At least a dozen pastors stated that they have no counselors or advisers at all. A creative approach to this matter is reported by a North Central pastor who comments:

> We have found adults most interested and willing to work with students when asked. Those who work directly with students are appointed by the pastor and Associate Director of the Wesley Foundation. Four adults serve as advisers to the Associate Director. He meets with them monthly and they discuss the entire program with the students. Each one is assigned specific responsibilities and works with a group of students relating to his responsibilities. For example, one adult works with students on study groups, another on deputations and outreach, and another on Sunday morning and evening programs. This group can be enlarged if necessity calls for it.

Sixty-five per cent of the pastors reported that their advisers have had "considerable training" for their jobs, and ninety-six more have had "some training." This totals 161 or 72.2 per cent who have had at least some preparation. Indicating that their advisers had "no training" or background were thirty-nine, to which must be added twenty-four who made no comment. Seventy-eight or 35 per cent said that they thought their advisers would be willing to attend a one week summer laboratory school for training if it could be set up on a regional or national scale. Seventeen or 11.1 per cent of the pastors figured that their lay advisers would not attend such a school if they were given the opportunity to do so. Twenty-six pastors or 11.6 per cent made no comment about this matter.

2. "Town and Gown" Relations

In response to inquiry regarding the status of relations between the residents of the local parish and the student segment of the congregation, a preponderance of 61.5 per cent of the pastors reported that the association was a good one; fifty-five or 24.5 per cent reported fair relations; sixteen or 7.1 per cent reported poor relations; and fifteen or 6.7 per cent made no comment.

D. Summary

In this chapter more pieces of the "jig-saw" w ich represent the intricate structure of the typical university parish pastor as he labors at the near-campus Methodist church in the United States today have been identified and slipped into place. Through a tabulation of general and institutional data received fr m the 224 respondents, his maturity as a Methodist minister has been established and his probable tenure in his present post has been determined. Even though parishioners at a university post might desire the services of a newly-graduated seminarian for their preaching pastor because he is young and "would appeal to the students," the chances are against such an untried pastor being appointed to such a pulpit. He must have several years of seasoning in more normal Methodist situations. Not only is it unlikely from the standpoint of actuarial possibility that a very young pastor will be appointed to such a post, but usually a Methodist Bishop hesitates to assign a younger man to such a station because he has not earned the right nor the experience to serve a church of 975 members, which is the average size of the Methodist college or university congregation. A majority of the churches of this

magnitude are leading churches in their respective Conferences and enjoy a salary rating considerably above the minimum which is considered fair for beginning preachers. Therefore, the appointive system being what it is in the Methodist Church, it is understandable that most university parish pastors are among the more mature members of their respective Conferences.

Also, it was established in this chapter that nearly three-fourths of the pastors covered in this study are serving their first university parish stations, and that by the law of averages if former appointive trends continue most of them will not be re-appointed to college situations when they are transferred to other churches.

Formal qualifications of the typical pastor have been ascertained, and it is agreed that he is not likely to have advanced academically beyond the winning of his all-purpose Bachelor of Divinity degree. His special training in student work has been found to be scanty, and as long as he stand limited chance for permanent status as a university parish pastor, and as long as the cost of further formal training is so expensive in time and personal outlay of cash--his likelihood of gaining further specialized schooling for his work is discouraging.

The chapter evaluated the pastor's entertainment of students in his home, and it would seem advantageous if a subsidy for this activity might be promoted so that the major share of the cost is not paid by the pastor. The effect of distance of the campus from the parish church on the pastor's ministry to students was measured. The chapter was concluded by tabulating data which demonstrate the local pastor's strategic responsibility as a link of communication between the members of his congregation and the university community--as well as his key position in the procuring and training of student counselors and advisers.

Now that the general nature of the typical university parish pastor has been sketched, it is time to fill in the more intimate features of his portrait. This will be done in succeeding chapters as data concerning the specific functions of his ministry to students are observed and evaluated. The first function of this pastor to be analyzed will be his preaching function.

CHAPTER XI

ANALYSIS OF QUESTIONNAIRE CONTINUED

THE PREACHING FUNCTION[1]

In order to add lights and shadows to the portrait of the typical university parish pastor, the writer will now turn to an analysis of data returned from the questionnaire in an attempt to measure what respondents are doing in respect to the five peculiar functions through which they relate to student life; namely, preaching, counseling, teaching, evangelism, and administration. This chapter will begin such an analysis with a consideration of the preaching function.

A. Analysis of the Data

Because the preaching function was ranked first in importance by an overwhelming majority of four to one, data from this section of the poll were tabulated first. Let us now examine a summary of facts, figures, and feelings of men on the field as they reply to page three of the questionnaire.

1. Sermon Types and Their Order of Importance

In answer to question one, which asked respondents to rate five types of sermons in order of their importance, tabulation of nation-wide returns is illustrated in Table 22. A glance at this table quickly establishes life-situation preaching as the most popular form of

---

[1]See Appendix A, p. 523.

sermonizing by the university parish pastors who responded in this study. This form of preaching outscores by six to one any other single type of sermon on the check-list.

TABLE 22

RELATIVE IMPORTANCE OF SERMON TYPES

	Rated order of importance				
Type of sermon	1	2	3	4	5
Life situation	151	34	12	9	14
Expository	14	46	51	63	35
Textual	23	38	58	51	48
Doctrinal	10	43	45	42	53
Bible-centered	24	53	45	35	55

Second place in the poll went to Bible-centered preaching; third place went to textual preaching; fourth place went to expository sermons; and last place went to doctrinal discourses. In weighing these data, allowance needs to be made for the facts that (1) the three types of sermons (textual, doctrinal, Bible-centered) overlap considerably and caused a sense of confusion in the minds of some of the respondents; and that (2) judgment seems to be colored by the fact that having made a first and second choice, etc., other choices which might rank equally or nearly as high in the estimation of the respondents must be ranked lower in importance because first and second opportunities for ranking have been used up.

It is significant that doctrinal preaching at Methodist university churches appears to be less popular than either the Bible-centered, textual, or expository method.

One outstanding conformity is revealed here, i.e., that life-situation preaching heads the list in every jurisdiction. That there was some variance between the jurisdictions in the way the pastors rated other types of sermons is demonstrated by a look at respective sections of the poll. For example, Western choices reveal greater preference for a combination of expository-doctrinal sermons than for Bible-centered preaching (which rated last--but not by a notable margin).

North Central choices indicate that Bible-centered sermons are somewhat more in favor in that area than the expository-textual-doctrinal combination, with textual outstripping doctrinal. In the Northeast, expository sermons take a lead over textual-doctrinal-Bible-centered messages--with the latter rating last by a fairly heavy proportion. South Central rates the expository type somewhat higher than the Bible-related types. Southeastern pastors prefer Bible-centered, doctrinal, and expository sermons. Thus, it appears logical to assume that in the so-called "Bible belt" (including the deep south), Bible-centered and doctrinal preaching are more popular than anywhere else in the nation--whereas these latter types are least popular in the Northeast and in the West.

Additional types of sermons which respondents said that they would like to see included in this poll, together with the number of times they were suggested, are listed as follows: biographical sermons, seven times; topical sermons, five times; and social issues, three times. These sermon types were mentioned once: drama, analytical, seasonal, psychological, prophetic, theological and "God-centered." This listing of additional types of sermons was considered valuable by the writer because it reflects creative thought and participation on the part of the respondents.

The observer is impressed by the evident correlation between the kinds of answers returned in reply to this question and the periods and the sections of the nation in which the respondents were trained. For example, in the South there appears to be correlation between the popularity of "Bible-preaching" and the training of Southern pastors. Also, there might be some connection between the high place accorded by a majority of respondents to what the writer has called "life-situation" preaching and the period during which the respondents received their seminary training. It has been established that the typical Methodist pastor now preaching in a university parish pulpit is forty-five years old and that he has been preaching for about eighteen years. This would date his seminary training about the time when "life-situation" preaching (a form of homiletics popularized by Harry Emerson Fosdick nearly a quarter of a century ago) was in vogue. This would also account for the high place accorded to "life-situation" preaching in this poll.

Examination of data received in answer to question 1 also reflects the probability that the designations of the types of sermons on the check-list were not clear. They might have been titled differently and they might have included additional designations. For example, if the writer had used the designation "theological preaching" instead of "doctrinal preaching," perhaps it would have received more votes. Also, there might have been some confusion in the minds of more recent seminary graduates over the writer's use of the term "life-situation" preaching. If he had been able to find a better designation to describe the preaching of the basic notes of Christian faith in application to life, probably he should have used it here.

A number of comments were volunteered between the lines regarding sermon types. Characteristic of these comments the following are noted. A South Central pastor writes, "Students are people; they respond best as others do to warm-hearted life-situation preaching that has sound spiritual vitality." A Western respondent states:

> Our preaching must be didactic. The religious literacy of our Protestants is appalling. Sermons must be relevant and timely to current problems. The eternal God-man relationships must be presented in terms usable in our socio-ethic milieu.

A Wyoming pastor who is moved by the way the question is stated makes creative criticism in this quotation:

> Your classical definition of sermon content creates difficulty for me. My pattern of preaching is more nearly like this:
>
> Problem - in terms of religion's impact on life.
>
> Solutions - in terms of truth from Bible, teaching of Jesus, theological and doctrinal instights or religious norms.
>
> Plea for commitment or Decision - in terms of personal claims and duties, and in terms of right thinking.

2. Relation of Preaching to Counseling

One objective of the writer in this study was to attempt to determine what is going on in the field in regard to the practice of the separate functions of the pastors involved. It was also his objective (among others) to attempt to discover what effect some of these functions have upon and in relation to one another. For example, one might presume that the kind of preaching a pastor does might be reflected in the counseling that it provokes. In order to explore this area, question 3 was asked which invited respondents to indicate how much direct

relationship they have discovered between their preaching and the number of students who seek them out for personal counseling. A summary of this material is presented in Table 23.

TABLE 23

DEGREE OF RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN PREACHING AND COUNSELING

	Considerable		Some		None	
Jurisdiction	Number	Per cent	Number	Per cent	Number	Per cent
Western	5	14.3	27	77.0	3	8.6
North Central	16	27.6	38	65.5	4	6.9
Northeastern	10	29.4	24	70.6	2	5.9
South Central	15	33.3	25	55.6	3	6.7
Southeastern	15	31.2	30	62.5	2	4.2
Totals	61	27.6[a]	144	66.0[a]	14	6.4[a]

[a]Average of percentages

Since this is a study by jurisdictions as well as by national measurement, some of the tables will indicate percentage figures on a jurisdictional scale. The above table indicates the percentage of returns from each area. It is quickly discernable that pastors of the South Central area lead the jurisdictions in declaring that they see considerable correlation between their preaching and counseling--with one-third of their number so reporting. Southeastern ranks second; Northeastern and North Central were close behind; and Western finished considerably farther down the scale. A span of only 6 per cent separates the four highest ranking areas, but the West is nearly 20 per cent below the leader.

Western, however, leads the "some" category. Respondents who considered that there was no appreciable relationship between their preaching and resultant personal counseling were few in number. It is observable that the percentage of pastors who checked the "none" category was highest in the Western Jurisdiction and lowest in the Southeastern Jurisdiction. Five respondents did not check this question.

Tabulation of data returned in answer to this question resulted in the following summary: sixty-one pastors checked the "considerable" category for a percentage of 27.8; one hundred forty-four pastors checked the "some" category for a percentage of 65.7; and fourteen pastors checked the "none" category for a percentage of 6.5. It was observed that nineteen out of twenty pastors in the nation think that there is or should be definite correlation between these two functions of their ministry as they are operable among students.

Personal comments contributed by pastors in answer to this question will be reserved until data concerning the counseling function are tabulated.[1] Also, these data will figure in assumptions drawn from cross-tabulation of findings later in the dissertation.[2]

3. Preaching to Students

In an attempt to discover and to evaluate what kind of preaching is being done by the university parish pastor, five questions of this page of the instrument are reviewed corporately in Table 24. They are blocked together because they are similar in nature and because each

---

[1]Below, p. 272.

[2]Ibid., p. 407.

serves to explore a related phase of a common inquiry. Table 24 indicates what pastors are doing in five homiletical areas of preaching in relation to the students in their respective congregations. These questions are not exhaustive, but they are representative inquiries intended to elicit the kind of a general line of preaching that is being followed. A review of the replies will be helpful.

TABLE 24

THE PASTOR'S PREACHING METHODS

Questions[a]	Per cent considerable	Per cent some	Per cent none	Per cent no answer
2. How much do you slant sermons at student life?	27.1	66.4	4.1	1.8
4. How often do you use illustrations from campus life in preaching?	13.8	80.0	5.8	.4
5. How often do you use campus phraseology and "jargon" in your sermons?	1.3	60.0	36.0	2.7
6. Do you do "block-preaching?"	17.4	46.0	30.3	6.2
7. Do you just preach to everybody, with only occasional reference to students?	43.7	38.4	4.1	13.8

[a]The identifying numbers refer to questions on the questionnaire. See Appendix A, p. 523.

a. Directing sermons at students in the congregation: In reply to question 2, answers were tabulated according to three categories; considerable, some, and none. For the purpose of visual observation Table 25 breaks down how answers to this question were tabulated. This table also illustrates how succeeding questions which require an answer of

"Considerable _____; Some _____; None _____" will be tabulated.

TABLE 25

HOW MUCH PREACHING IS SLANTED AT STUDENTS

Jurisdiction	Considerable		Some		None	
	Number	Per cent	Number	Per cent	Number	Per cent
Western	12	34.4	21	58.6	2	5.7
North Central	13	22.4	43	74.0	2	3.5
Northeastern	10	29.4	23	67.8	1	2.9
South Central	15	33.4	29	64.4	1	2.2
Southeastern	12	24.5	33	68.8	3	6.2
Totals	62	-- -	149	-- -	9	- -

That there was considerable interest in the thrust of question 2 was indicated by the fact that only four respondents made no comment about it. Otherwise replies were divided by variation of a little more than two to one between a conservative "some" and an enthusiastic "considerable." Western leads the poll in the "considerable" category and Southeastern predominates in the "some" division. In fairness to men who gave a "none" answer, the tabulator had a feeling that although these respondents returned a negative reply they were not preaching Sunday after Sunday entirely unmindful of the university segment of their congregations.

Illustrations of those who claim sermons ought to be directed rather obviously at students came from pastors who have a large student group in their pews. Such a pastor contributes:

> Students are so obviously a part of my congregation that I am sure that often my preaching is considerably toward them--and often they realize this. . . . I do try to preach to a "whole" congregation, but the students and I are quite conscious of each other.

A western pastor who favors "slanting" adds:

> Frequently we combine a Sunday morning sermon to impinge specifically on student problems or to guide in vocational choice. Thus the speaker has real opportunity for a person-to-person follow-up.

In order not to direct homiletical offerings at the student crowd to the exclusion of other segments of the Sunday morning congregation, one Northeastern pastor gives opportunity for a follow-up in what he calls a "come-back-at-the-preacher session" around a cup of coffee in the ladies' parlor after the Sunday morning preaching hour. Thos who are not interested do not attend.

The predominant number of pastors who are conscious that the university element needs some recognition on Sunday mornings but that the needs of this group should not be overemphasized to the neglect of other worshippers are exemplified by the reaction of the Southeastern pastor who reports:

> I know that I could minister to students better if I slanted sermons more at their particular interests and needs, but I feel that would be unfair to my ministry and to the total church. I feel that students should have their particular needs met in their evening fellowship and should enter morning worship as a part of the total church.--Of course one can't help keeping them in mind during sermon preparation.

Another pastor in this group who is reluctant to direct his sermons solely at students confides that on occasion he refers to student needs into his pastoral prayer. He feels that by so doing he comes closer to meeting the yearning for recognition and acceptance on the part of the

university segment more effectively, even though more subtly, than by preaching straight at it.

b. Use of illustrations from campus life: Observation of Table 24 regarding data compiled in answer to question 4 reveals similar reactions to data that were returned in answer to question 2. The "some" category predominates. A total of 179 pastors indicated that they were willing to use some illustrations from campus life in comparison to thirty-one pastors who used them more profusely, and in contrast to thirteen pastors who used none. There was a feeling on the part of most of the respondents, however, that the practice should not be overworked. Only one pastor failed to register a choice in this part of the poll. Since this question was similar to question 2, there was little creative comment between the lines elicited.

c. Use of campus phraseology and "jargon" in sermons: Question 5 produced a flood of reactions ranging from emphatic resistance against considerable use of campus phraseology and "jargon" in sermons to about a two-thirds acceptance of the "some" category. According to Table 24, a little more than one-third of the pastors didn't believe in the practice at all. There were no preachers in the Western or South Central Jurisdictions who condoned considerable use, and only one pastor in each of the other three areas who believed in profuse use. The ratios of the other categories in this tabulation were relatively proportionate throughout the jurisdictions.

There were many written replies to this question which are worthy of comment. Twenty per cent responded to the effect that they considered

this practice "talking down to students, who resent patronizing." Another 20 per cent were of the opinion that such a custom is "unnecessary and in poor taste, with nothing to be gained by it." A half-dozen others wrote that they believed in preaching to student needs but that it could easily be overdone. Two admitted that they were not close enough to students to speak their "jargon" and when they tried to do so, "it turns out phony." Others commented, "It lowers the minister's role"; "This is 'apple-polishing' and students resent it when they want to worship"; and "It reflects arfiticiality." One of the pastors, however, confided, "I'm just beginning to do this"; and another advised, "The use of mild humor is O.K."

The observation of a Northeastern preacher which is typical of a number of replies is worth quoting:

> I hope that I speak the student's language--that is I hope I communicate! I do not deliberately sprinkle the sermon with campus slang, which I regard as a sign of immaturity. I take a broad aim that people of all ages will listen and be helped.

What many of the pastors were trying to say is aptly articulated in the words of the Western preacher who quipped, "It can be overdone, and flippancy is out of place. 'Love' spelled 'LUV' is not in the interest of the average student."

The tabulator felt that most pastors have a real desire to communicate to the needs of students through the sermon, but that they are unwilling to "ham" it up by deliberately "stepping out of character to talk down to their listeners." The word "jargon" was a "red flag" that provoked a stampede. There was virtually a 100 per cent reaction to this question.

d. Block preaching at special seasons: In response to question 6, which inquired about the value of "block preaching" to students in the congregation at special seasons of the college calendar, Table 24 reveals that 103 or nearly half the respondents indicated that they estimated such practice had some value; thirty-nine thought that it had considerable value; and only fourteen professed that they had never tried it. The custom appeared to be somewhat more in vogue in the South Central Jurisdiction than elsewhere. It appeared to be least in vogue in the Northeast. Exampling the pastors who protest the custom is a North Central preacher who notes, "I hate special days"; a South Central representative who writes, "This can be hazardous, as students do not like to be singled out"; and a northeasterner who comments, "I don't do it, but my students know I'm preaching to them regardless." One Southern pastor reveals that he missed the point entirely when he quips, "I preach to my students as a block every Sunday!"

A "down-easterner" who takes a "middle-of-the road" attitude replies, "I try to reach all groups in each sermon"; and another rejoins, "I find that a sermon that hits home with the average Sunday morning church goer also hits home with the students."

An understanding Oklahoma pastor catches the intended spirit of the question and responds with a creative comment that merits recording in entirety:

> We have two instances of "Block-preaching." One involves University Mother's Day on the campus. This is the week-end before national Mother's Day. Mothers come to the campus to spend 2 1/2 days as guests of their sons or daughters--residing in campus houses as students "double up."

On that day we have three Sunday morning worship services at 7, 8:30 and 11. We try to get all local townspeople to attend at 7 o'clock, leaving the other two periods for students and their mother-guests. The sermon and service are "slanted" to the occasion.

We also have a Mid-Term Sermon Series. We discovered that on the three Sundays between Christmas holidays and "dead-week" before finals all the students are on the campus and available for church.

Letters are sent to each student announcing the series and the sermon topics. Themes and individual sermons are arranged in a progression and slanted toward student interest. For example, one year we used "Prayer" as the general theme and broke this into three sub-divisions, one for each Sunday. I find the townspeople take interest in this series.

e. Preaching to everyone, with only occasional reference to students: Tabulated returns of answers to question 7, summarized in Table 24, teach us little that we did not learn from question 2. It is a converse statement of question 2, and tabulated results are reversed in about the same proportion, excepting that nearly 14 per cent of the respondents did not answer the question.

4. The Student's Point of View

Returns from two questions which endeavored to measure the reaction of students to preaching at the Sunday morning worship hour are blocked together in this section of the analysis. Data are summarized in Table 26.

a. Students as critics of preaching: How critical are students of the pulpit utterances of the university parish pastor? It may be dangerous to ask a preacher for his own opinion of what students think of his preaching. However, this is about the only way the observer can get an estimate of what the pastor thinks students are saying about his

TABLE 26

REACTIONS OF STUDENTS TO PREACHING

Questions[a]	Per cent considerable	Per cent some	Per cent none	Per cent no answer
8. Do you find students critical of your preaching?	19.2	55.5	24.0	1.3
9. How much would a student rather take part in a discussion himself than hear a sermon?	25.9	55.5	10.3	8.3

[a]The identifying numbers refer to questions on the questionnaire. See Appendix A, p. 523.

preaching. Also, it might be difficult for a preacher to get an honest answer from his students about his performance in the pulpit without having a number of interviews with them. Some students would rather "flatter the preacher with sweet talk than fluster him with frankness," and no doubt a more accurate poll on this matter could be taken in a dormitory session at midnight than at 11:55 o'clock on Sunday morning on the church steps. Nevertheless, making reasonable concessions for distortion by the pastor and for reluctance on the part of the student, a review of data returned from question 8 (as visualized in Table 26) reveals that three-fourths of the preachers think that students exercise their later-adolescent prerogative to be critical of the Sunday sermon either moderately or severely. One hundred twenty-four pastors said that students were somewhat critical, and thirty-four pastors stated that students were sharp in their judgment. One in four pastors didn't believe that students were any more caustic in their criticism than other members of the congregation. There were only three "no-answers" tabulated.

Northeastern opinion was equally divided between "considerable," "some," and "none," with twelve votes cast for each category. Otherwise the jurisdictional proportion of the balloting did not vary from the national norm.

At least forty creative remarks were typed on the reverse side of returns from this question. One-third of these comments agreed that although students may appear to be highly critical of their pastor's sermons, their criticism is of a positive nature. They indicated that during the sermon a learning process is taking place in which the students are trying to find the core of discussion. In this regard one pastor wrote, "Even their disagreement seems healty--indicating that learning is taking place." Another who remarked, "Their criticism becomes meaningful in counseling," has discovered that when a student appears to disagree with an opinion of the pastor he may be seeking an excuse to structure personal interviews. At least three rejoined, "They are apathetic and lack acumen; not critical enough!" One respondent marked his instrument simply with the words, "Enough said."

Pastors seemed to reflect in corporate judgment that while it is characteristic of the student mind to be critical, for the most part such criticism is genuine, and pastors could profit by it if they took it "with a grain of salt"; for example, the Western minister who says, "If preaching isn't germane, students can be very sharp." A North Central preacher whose congregation is 75 per cent students adds, "They are not critical of preaching as such, only critical of issues contrary to their understanding." A South Central man with an understanding spirit says, "Students are members of families and tend to reflect family reactions to sermons." In the same mood a Southeastern pastor reflects:

> Most of our students come from small rural churches and our Sunday morning services may appear too formal for them to feel at home. For this reason they respond more to the informal student-centered Sunday evening service.

A creative way to handle criticism of the Sunday morning sermon so that it can become a learning situation for both pastor and students has been discovered by a Tennessee preacher who describes his practice of conducting a forum after Church at which the sermon is discussed. Both negative and constructive criticisms of the sermon are offered and accepted. Students feel that they are participating and that they have a chance "to get back at somebody." The pastor benefits from the criticisms and deliberately "uses" the structured situation to produce opportunities for personal counseling--which will be discussed in the next chapter.

b. Discussing or listening: In tabulating answers to question 9 (summarized in Table 26), as to whether students would rather take part in a discussion than hear a sermon, the tabulator must make allowance for the natural instinct of the average preacher to have a good opinion of his own utterances. Unless the pastor is used to having formal interviews with students (and keeping notes on them), he might not be able to answer this question in a factual way. However, data returned do indicate a trend, which, in relation to information received from other questions, does help to "shape up one of the corners" on a piece of our jig-saw picture of the composite pastor in the university pulpit. Although question 9 is related to question 8, it is interesting to discover that the returns to the "some" category of both questions figure identically to the first decimal point. The "considerable" tally is nearly 6 per cent higher in question 9 than it was for question 8. More pastors made no reply to

question 9 than to question 8--from which one may deduce that some pastors either did not understand the question or that they were too interested in their own estimate of preaching to reason that the question had merit.

In correlating the "none" categories of questions 8 and 9, by virtue of the former's ratio being 24 per cent and the latter's being 10.3 per cent, it might be assumed that students would rather criticize a sermon than discuss it. However, this deduction can only be inferred, as evidence is not conclusive.

There appeared to be a measure of conformity in the way jurisdictions compared in percentage ratios ranging the four categories listed in Table 26--with the exception that the "considerable" category registered about 25 per cent higher in the Western and Southwestern areas in returns from question 9, as contrasted to returns from question 8. Some examples of between-the-lines comment provoked by this question are worth noting. A number of pastors agreed that students need both sermons and an opportunity to discuss them. A few pastors felt that students get enough opportunity to discuss at their own meetings. One suggests, "Students prefer preaching because far more come to preaching services than turn up at Sunday evening discussion groups"; and another who missed the point of the question stated, "Far too many attend preaching to take part in a discussion."

The tabulator was impressed with the homespun summation of this matter by a Northeastern rural pastor who philosophized, "Students might prefer bull sessions, but I think they also like to listen to something the minister has to say to them." A Southeasterner who makes a point but misses the thrust of the query drawls:

> Our purpose in the Sunday morning service is to worship God--not to discuss him. The discussion type of service should never, in my opinion, supplant the usual Sunday sermon.

5. Attitudes of Students Towards Guest Speakers

A block of two questions, 10 and 11, concludes page three of the instrument. They reflect attitudes as to how the preacher feels about student reaction to reliquishing the pulpit upon occasion to university pulpit guests who are pulpiteers of some recognition and who have a reputation for preaching to students. A review of data returned from this line of questioning is summarized as follows:

a. Guest preachers: Reactions to question 10 show that 88 per cent of the pulpits are open on occasion to guest speakers on the terms stated in the question. Conversely, 12 per cent of the pulpits across the nation are not free to visiting speakers. There were no "no-answers" in this category. The highest percentage of reluctance to agree with the wisdom of this practice is credited to the Northeastern Jurisdiction where one in four preachers would rather not share their pulpits with guest pastors.

Returns from question 10a, which inquired as to the number of guest pastors invited to preach during the past year, revealed that a national average of 2.65 guest appearances of visiting preachers were scheduled for each church during the year. Jurisdictionally, the average number of guest speakers per year who were scheduled to speak in university parish pulpits were tabulated as follows: Western had an average of 2.4 guest appearances; North Central had an average of 2.3 guest appearances; Northeastern had an average of 2.4 guest appearances; South Central had

an average of 3.1 guest appearances; and Southeastern had an average of 3.1 guest appearances.

Poignant comments which illustrate returns to this inquiry are made by the South Central pastor who protests, "They have to be at least ten times as objective as I am before I invite them"; by the Northeasterner who testifies, "We have had some unfortunate experiences here with over-rated speakers when the unfavorable reaction was surprising"; or by the creative "twist" of the North Central pastor who reports, "It depends on whether a church is related to a tax-supported school." A South Central pastor who had rather not "lend his lectern" to strangers says:

> We do not use visiting firemen on Sunday. Students would rather listen to their own inferior preacher who appears with a "sameness" than to the visitor. Campuses have many, many visitors, and students don't especially want this at worship on Sunday.

b. Reaction of students: Question 11 polled the pastors' opinions about the reactions of students to guest preachers. The reactions appeared to vary from speaker to speaker. The availability of acceptable speakers and the degree of skill with which the host pastor selects preaching guests seemed to be important factors in the answering of this question. Data from this question tallied according to the following pattern: "favorable," 55.7 per cent; "unfavorable," 2.7 per cent; "indifferent," 27.6 per cent; and "no-comment," 13.8 per cent. Including the "no-comments" with the "indifferent," the results were about as evenly divided between positive and negative as were returns from question 10a.

Written comments about the reactions of students to guest preachers came mostly from the indifferent. A majority of these comments came from the North Central area, as exemplified by one pastor who reports, "I get little reaction, one way or the other;" and another who says, "Students just don't show up when a stranger is announced"; and another who states, "It depends entirely upon the quality of the man"; and still another who replies, "Students hear the 'greats' like Fosdick, Buttrick and Crane at the college chapel, so we just don't try to compete." A lone South Central representative concedes, "They would if my pulpit committee would invite them."

B. Summary

In retrospect of Chapter XI we find that additional touches have been added which bring the portrait of the typical university parish pastor into sharper focus. Since he believes that preaching is his most important operative function as he relates to students, he agrees that life-situation preaching is an effective way to exercise this function. Bible-centered sermons rank second. He discovers definite correlation between his preaching and the counseling that it elicits among students.

He directs sermons at his students in the Sunday morning congregation moderately rather than considerably, being persuaded that temporate use of illustrations from campus life is justified and profitable. He hesitates to use of campus "jargon" for fear of patronizing, but he realizes that he must find suitable ways in which to communicate with the student mind in a relevant manner. He is more likely than not to do occasional "block-preaching" to students at special seasons and on special

days. He recognizes his obligation to enlist the empathy of all segments of his Sunday morning crowd rather than to cater to students.

He finds students somewhat critical of his preaching, but not unjustly or unfairly so--considering the argumentative and rejective nature of later-adolescence. He would rather have students come to church and be critical of his preaching than have them stay away and be silent. In his estimation probably the average student would rather hear one of the pastor's sermons than enjoy discussing its central theme, but this is a matter of the pastor's opinion that must be weighed. He leans towards an admission that a combination of preaching and discussion form a more properly balanced ration for the student than the nurture provided by a diet of either one to the exclusion of the other.

His pulpit is open to 2.65 guest preachers per year who are carefully screened for their ability to speak in a manner that is relevant to student life. He believes that a majority of his students will receive the preaching of such pulpit guests with interest and with profit if it is acceptably done.

It is now time to analyze data that were returned in answer to questions about the second function of the university parish pastor as he relates to students, namely, counseling.

CHAPTER XII

ANALYSIS OF QUESTIONNAIRE CONTINUED
THE COUNSELING FUNCTION[1]

Counseling rated second in importance among the functions of the university parish pastor as he relates to student life, according to the results of the nationwide poll established in Chapter VIII.[2] This chapter will deal with the counseling function, therefore, and be concerned with an analysis of data returned from page four of the questionnaire.

A. An Analysis of the Data

Returns were tabulated in answer to ten questions on this page, with the expectation that their summary would give added depth to the composition of the typical university parish pastor as he sits for his portrait. Data observed from tabulation of this page of the instrument will be treated in seven sections.

1. Relationship Between Preacher and Counselor

The writer has suggested previously that the preaching of the ideal pastor at a university parish post ought to be directly reflected in the amount and in the quality of the personal counseling that he does with individual students.[3] In the preceding chapter the writer

---

[1]See Appendix A, p. 524.

[2]Above, p. 189

[3]Above, p. 123

established that nineteen out of twenty preachers believe that there is or that there ought to be a relationship between their preaching and their counseling.[1] These facts having been established, the writer will now examine relative data and through an observance of them attempt to discover whether the performance of the pastors in the field compares or contrasts with the performance of the ideal pastor in regard to the operation of the counseling function. Let us observe the data and see whether such a relationship exists, and if so to what degree it exists.

Table 27 demonstrates that more than 95 percent of the pastors claim to do some form of counseling with students. Pastors who practice "considerable" counseling outnumber those who do "some" counseling by a ratio of about four to three. Six pastors, or 2.7 percent, failed to answer the question.

On the basis of jurisdictional percentage, more pastors who claim to do "considerable" counseling live in the midwest than live anywhere else in the country. South Central leads with a 66.9 percent rate, and a 62.7 percent rate is indicated for North Central. Western ranks lowest in the "considerable" column. A variation of nearly 35 percentage points is discernable between the highest and the lowest (South Central and Western) in the "considerable" category.

Off-setting Western's poor showing in the "considerable" category is the top ranking of that jurisdiction in the "some"

---

[1] Above, p. 256

category with 65.7 percent. Also, it must be pointed out that no pastors in the West claimed that they did no counseling at all, and no pastors of that area refused to answer the question. A healthy norm is set for both the "considerable" and the "some" category by Northeastern, which appears to rate about medium in both categories.

TABLE 27

HOW MUCH PREACHING IS RELATED TO COUNSELING

	Considerable		Some		None		No answer	
Jurisdiction	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Western	12	34.3	23	67.5	0	0.0	0	0.0
North Central	37	62.7	18	30.5	2	3.4	2	3.4
Northeastern	20	55.6	16	44.4	0	0.0	0	0.0
South Central	31	69.0	10	22.2	0	0.0	4	8.8
Southeastern	25	51.1	22	45.0	2	4.8	0	0.0
Totals	125	55.8[a]	89	39.7[a]	4	1.8[a]	6	2.7[a]

[a]Average percentage of column above

Upon observation, one is swayed by three impressions which ought to be weighed in analyzing these figures: (1) that pastors' individual definitions of the words "considerable" and "some" may vary (i.e., what might be called "considerable" by some might be regarded as few by others, etc.); (2) that pastors' definitions of counseling will vary, and (3) that some pastors might do little counseling but in answering a questionnaire they might be tempted to send in a good report. Concessions may have to be made when the data are examined critically.

Few comments were offered between the lines here (much fewer than were elicited by the preaching section), possibly because the pastors concerned did not possess a vocabulary to talk about it and lacked the language of communication. They seem to have a feeling that a pastor's preaching ought to be correlated with his counseling, but they don't know how to talk about it.

Representative of those who did make limited comment in response to this question is the South Central pastor who indicates that there ought to be a considerable degree of relationship between the practice of the two functions, although he feels that there is some danger in deliberately structuring such a relationship.

Illustrative of the practice of many pastors who indicate that they would do more counseling with students if and when they were able to get around to it is the honest Arkansas preacher who says:

> There should be considerable direct relationship between my preaching and my counseling with individual students. But this is an ideal that simply doesn't work out with me, since I actually spend little time counseling students.

At this time the writer does not intend to touch up the portrait of the typical college church preacher so that it will present a prettier profile. He does wish to make it clear, however, that although the average university parish pastor appears to be making slow progress in this area of his ministry to students, there are no indications revealed in the data which suggest that he is not profoundly interested in his exercise of the counseling function. Nor is the writer ready to predict that the average pastor could not become more adept at counseling with students if he got some training and some experience.

2. Hours of Counseling

Analysis of questions 2 and 3 are blocked together under this heading because they are related to one another and because it is possible to summarize their returns in the same table--Table 28.

a) Published hours for counseling: Question 2 was asked in an attempt to determine whether there is uniformity or deviation among pastors covered by the canvass regarding the publishing of regular counseling periods when they make themselves available to students. In Table 28 "Yes" and "No" answers to this question were tabulated to emphasize the positive and negative aspects of the same inquiry. The table discloses that about one-third of the pastors surveyed make it known through the church bulletin, published office hours, word of mouth, or other media that they reserve specific

hours for personal counseling and clearly identify those hours. Western and North Central Jurisdictions lead the nation in this practice, with about two out of every five pastors claiming that they make such a publication of their availability for counseling.

TABLE 28

DO PASTORS PUBLISH HOURS FOR COUNSELING?
AND
AVERAGE HOURS OF COUNSELING PER WEEK PER PASTOR

Jurisdiction	"Yes" answers	Per-cent	"No" answers	Per-cent	Hours per week
Western	14	40.0	21	60.0	3.0
North Central	24	40.8	35	59.2	3.3
Northeastern	13	36.0	23	64.0	2.7
South Central	12	26.7	33	73.3	2.7
Southeastern	14	28.6	35	71.4	4.0
Totals	77	34.3[a]	147	65.7[a]	3.1[b]

[a]Average percentage of column above

[b]Average of total hours per week of jurisdiction

The poorest record in this aspect of the counseling function is reported by South Central, where it is evident that either less personal consultation with the pastor is going on or that the practice simply is not as prevalent. The writer established in Chapter IX that the South Central area ranked highest in the nation in preference of preaching

over counseling.[1] Is it a coincidence that also the largest crowds of students attending preaching services are found in the south? Could it be that there is such a heavy emphasis on preaching in this area that it doesn't seem important for a preacher to be business like about making his availability for personal counseling known? Or perhaps it is because the South is more tradition-minded.

b) Hours of counseling per week: One hundred sixty-six pastors disclosed that they functioned as counselors with students one or more hours per week. Fifty-eight pastors indicated that they spent no time in counseling or neglected to answer the question at all.[2] Ten of the latter noted, "Don't know." This question elicited one of the poorest corporate responses of the study. It indicates that personal counseling is not considered an important function of the college pastor's ministry in some areas.

By jurisdictions pastors who spent at least one hour per week in counseling with students were distributed as follows: Western, 29; North Central, 42; Northeastern, 33; South Central, 29; and Southeastern, 33. Cumulative hours of pastoral counseling per week with students as reported by the 166 pastors in the five jurisdictions were tabulated as follows: Western, 102 hours; North Central, 197 hours; Northeastern, 97 hours; South Central, 123 hours; and Southeastern, 195 hours. The grand total number of hours of counseling per week in the nation was

---

[1]Above, p. 221

[2]See right hand column of Table 24.

714 hours. These figures are resolved into hours per week of counseling per man on a jurisdictional basis in the right hand column of Table 28.

Although Southeastern ranked high in total hours of counseling per week, this area was also high in the number of pastors who reported no counseling going on. Also it should be pointed out that figures were thrown askew by three pastors reporting a total of 125 of these 195 hours. These three men reported sixty, thirty-five and thirty hours per week, respectively. Not counting the reports of these three men, Southeastern showed the poorest accomplishment in counseling of all the areas.

This part of the study is made more meaningful when it is pointed out that if the fifty-eight pastors who failed to report counseling going on are not counted, the average number of counseling hours per week would have been 4.3, or nearly one hour more of counseling per week per pastor. Most total hours per week were reported by North Central, with 197. This high average was achieved because one pastor reported thirty hours per week of counseling going on in his parish.

The briefest period of counseling reported and recognized in this summary was one hour per week, and the most number of hours per week reported by one man was sixty. A review of the profile of the four men who reported thirty hours or more of counseling is worth while. One lives in the North Central area, and the other three labor in the Southeast. Reference to them will be made by coded number, since details of the study are confidential.

Pastor NC8, who reports thirty hours per week of counseling, has a ministerial record of twenty-five years of effective service in the Methodist ministry, with nineteen years spent in the same campus-related church. He had some courses in counseling while he was attending seminary and he has kept up his reading and study in the field since student days. Part of his training includes a twelve-week session of clinical observation at a mental hospital while studying abnormal psychology. He reports a Methodist-preference list of 2,780 students on the near-by campus, of whom he reaches 1,000 vitally and another 1,000 casually (for a total of 2,000). He preaches to a weekly crowd of 1,350 students among his congregation, of whom 100 are listed on the full membership roll. No use of the affiliate relation is maintained.

All three of the other pastors who report thirty or more hours of personal counseling per week labor in the Southeastern Jurisdiction.

Pastor SE24, who reports thirty hours per week, is the youngest of the group, With ten years of pastoral experience, three of these years have been spent in a college situation. He has had some graduate training in clinical counseling and has also specialized in marriage counseling. He reports a Methodist-preference student group of 422 on the local campus, of whom he reaches 200 vitally and 200 casually (for a total of 400). He preaches to 300 students in his Sunday morning congregation, of whom 200 are affiliate members and twelve are recorded in full membership.

Pastor SE14, also reporting thirty hours of counseling per week, has had forty-three years of effective service in the Methodist ministry,

with twenty-nine of those years spent in four college situations. Included in his formal training for counseling are courses at a medical school. He serves the parish of a smaller college with a Methodist-preference list of 300, of whom he reaches twelve vitally and forty casually (for a total of fifty-six). There are 106 students in his Sunday morning worship service, forty of whom are enrolled as affiliate members.

Pastor SE12, who heads the list with a reported sixty hours of counseling per week, has been a Conference member for nineteen years. Twelve of these years have been spent at a single campus-related church. His training for counseling is the broadest of the four. He is a graduate of Danforth and Hazen courses in religion in higher education. He is a graduate of the Yale School of Alcohol Studies. He has taken regular courses in the department of education at a state university, and has kept abreast of the literature that has been produced in the field of counseling. He ministers to a campus church which has a responsibility list of 2,400 Methodist-preference students. He claims that he reaches 100 students vitally and another 750 casually (for a total of 850); that he preaches to an average of 100 students on Sunday morning, and that he lists six full members and one affiliate member on the roll of his church.

The writer thought that it might be profitable to compare the profiles of these four pastors who report thirty or more hours per week of counseling, and who indicate that they have had abundant formal training as well as several years of experience on the job in a

campus situation with an equal sampling of pastors who do one or two hours of reported counseling per week, and attempt to discover whether there is correlation in such areas as to the number of students reached and recorded on the respective church rolls.

But four is hardly a sufficient number upon which to establish firm grounds for a scientific inquiry here, and it might not be fair to choose the more active counselors for such comparing and contrasting. However, through this rapid review of the profiles of these four pastors who do considerable counseling it is possible to see a high degree of correlation between their training and years of experience at a university-related church and the results of their labor through counseling.

It is impossible to conclude from a superficial observation that counseling alone has been responsible for the good showing that these four men have made as university parish pastors. But one thing is clear--students <u>have</u> responded to the ministry of these men who have secured specialized training and have had several years of experience at a university parish church. Therefore, it might be logical to assume that the more specialized training the university parish pastor can get in the functional areas of his ministry to students, and the more years he can gain in uninterrupted acceptable service at a campus church, the better work he can do as a counselor.

3. Counseling Situations and Their Structuring.

Two related questions were asked in an endeavor to discover whether pastors are carrying on a program of counseling, and what kind of counseling they are doing. Data from questions 4 and 5 are analyzed herewith.

a) Activities resulting in counseling: In answer to question 4 which asked pastors to rate in importance some phases of their ministry which produced counseling situations, data were returned which are summarized in Table 29.

TABLE 29

SOURCES OF COUNSELING SITUATIONS

Pastor's activities that produce counseling situations	Total of percentages	Individual percentage rating
Preaching	6,930	34.5
Participating in student activities	4,585	22.9
Personal calling	1,685	8.4
Casual encounter	2,050	10.0
Being available	4,390	21.9
Other ways	462	2.3

The column of figures on the left in Table 29 represents the sum of all the participating pastors' estimations of the percentage values

of some of their activities that produce counseling situations with students. There were twenty-three pastors out of the total of 224 respondents who failed to answer this question. Therefore, the individual percentage per pastor which appears in the right hand column of Table 29 is established on the basis of the 201 pastors who contributed data in reply to this question.

Because of the fallibility of the human mind in its ability to make judgments of mathematical precision in areas that overlap and are somewhat nebulous; because of the extreme variation of the way in which pastors keep records and report them (some pastors do not keep records); and because the opinions of any large group of individuals regarding the proportional value of activities such as are listed in this question are bound to reflect diversity and lack of uniformity--the findings of these data cannot be tabulated and analyzed with mathematical precision.

Nevertheless, the direction which these figures take is conclusive enough to indicate that preaching is without a doubt the pastor's one activity that produces the most counseling situations with students. For example, with only one percentage point separating the category "participating in student activities" from the category "being available," it is impossible arbitrarily to claim that one of these categories rates second and that the other category rates third. They are so nearly equal in value that it would be more proper to say that they both rank second, and that "casual encounter" and "personal calling" rank fourth and fifth, respectively, with "other ways" ranking last.

This national order of ranking is confirmed throughout the separate jurisdictions with some exceptions that are noted as follows: Although the categories of "preaching" and "other ways" ranked first and last in every jurisdiction, the category of "being available" ranked second in Western, Northeastern, South Central and Southeastern Jurisdictions. Second place in North Central was accorded to "participating in student activities." Third place in all areas with the exception of North Central went to "participating in student activities," and fourth place in all but one jurisdiction was awarded to "casual encounter."

"Other ways," which allowed respondents to be creative and to add to the list of categories of their own inititiative, accounted for a little over two per cent of the total individual percentage rating. They were listed on the margin of the questionnaire in this order: "not named," six; "referred by Wesley Foundation students," five; "referred by faculty," three; "from teaching college classes for credit," two. The following were listed once each: "speaking in chapel," "marriage counseling," "program planning," and, "Their troubles bring them."

b) Ways of structuring counseling situations: Question 5, which invited respondents to share their experiences in how they create counseling situations by establishing relations with individual students, elicited a number of comments which reflect two trends. One school followed the line of reasoning that a good counselor never seeks out

the counselee because this puts the counselor at a disadvantage (i.e., he feels that he can do more good if the problem of the counselee force the counselee to come to the counselor). This might be called the position of the "professional" counselor.

Illustrative of this first position is the remark of the Southeastern pastor who says, "I do not seek counselees, because I cannot handle them properly if I do." Another Southeastern preacher writes, "I am kept so busy looking after a large pastorate that I do not create counseling situation." This point of view is explained by the South Central respondent who says:

> No counselor should ever seek to establish counseling relations by intimate personal relations. Any one who did this would be violating every known canon of sound counseling. I never heard of a counselor who sought to be a counselor to any particular individual on a particular problem. Good counselors are sought and do not have to "work up" their business.

A pastor from the Southeastern Jurisdiction says that he deliberately refuses to structure counseling situations with students for fear he will encroach upon the responsibilities of the Wesley Foundation worker or the Director of Religious Activities on the campus.

On the other hand, a second or opposite position is taken by the larger proportion of respondents who feel that they have a dual obligation to wear both the hat of the counselor and the hat of the pastor at the same time. They are aware of the danger involved when the counselor seems to be on the offensive. But this hazard is off-set by a counter realization that unless they deliberately make themselves available

as counselors and go the first mile towards seeking out students (who possibly would never allow their problems to push them towards the preacher) they have not fully discharged their responsibility towards the Methodist-preference students on the campus.

The point of view of this second school is shared by the Southeastern pastor who observes:

> I deliberately schedule campus or office appointments to seek the help of students in some program development -- which will most probably open a door for them to make an approach. Also, lunch periods or some similar period in quiet rest often provides opportunity for the student to open up.

Another pastor from the Western Jurisdiction describes how he handles this matter:

> Each semester a letter goes out from my desk to every student on the Methodist-preference list. In addition to a welcome they are offered all the personal services a pastor performs. On Saturdays and many evenings the student center is open where I drop in frequently. This results in much personal conversation and sets up some counseling. In a year's time it amounts to much counseling being done.

More than fifty additional comments describing how pastors structured counseling situations were elicited by this question. The most frequently mentioned of these are summarized as follows: attending student meetings and activities, including sports, plays and concerts; through program planning sessions and discussion groups; by announcement through public statements and the church publications; in entertaining students at parsonage coffee breaks, luncheons, and lounging in the recreation room; by personal visitation in dormitories and fraternity houses; by being available, interested and friendly, through visitation

of students enrolled in credit courses; by talking with the faculty, the university counselor and with fraternity advisers; by use of mail and the telephone; and by correspondence with the student's parents and peers.

4. Methods of Counseling Used

Question six was asked to determine what methods of counseling were being used on the field. Seven pastors failed to reply. The question listed four methods of counseling (non-directive or reflective, giving advice, just listening, and combination of several methods) and asked pastors to rate them in order of their use.[1]

First choice in popularity of these methods was tabulated as follows: "combination of methods," 117; "non-directive or reflective," fifty-eight; "just listening," forty-eight. Second choice was tallied as follows: "non-directive or reflective," sixty-three; "just listening," sixty; "combination of methods," thirty. Third choice was scored this way: "just listening," forty-one; "combination of methods," thirty-nine; "non-directive or reflective," twenty-nine.

In a separate blank provided for the optional listing of "other" additional methods, the following were suggested by a total of seven pastors: "professional marriage counseling," "client-centered therapy," (a form of non-directive counseling) and "talking about a problem as though it were a third party's."

Two things become apparent in this poll. Other details merge

---

[1] See Appendix A, p. 524.

into a maze and do not come into sharp focus. It is clearly established (1) that a "combination of methods" is the most popular practice, and (2) it is equally clear that "giving advice" is the least popular method used nationwide. In between these two variations one gets the impression that the most popular single method of counseling used is the non-directive or reflective style, with "just listening" running a close second. Because so many pastors "use up" their first choice by designating "combination of methods," it is difficult to determine the order in which they rank the remaining categories of specific methods. It becomes clear that these figures cannot be pressed for mathematical precision, but that they do indicate a trend.

The above figures were also confirmed on a jurisdictional basis, with the exception of one deviation; namely, the giving of advice is rated first choice by a fraction more in the Southeast than in any other area. This method of counseling is not rated first choice at all in the West or in the Northeast and only sparingly in the North Central area. A majority of the more creative written comments came from the Southeastern Jurisdiction, which evidenced the most interest in this method. Again, this shows more "traditionalism" and less professional training among pastors in this area.

5. Problem Areas of Student Concern

Question 7 was designed to discover what the respondents thought were the most important problems faced by students in the realm of counseling. It was also designed to discover, if possible, how skilled

the university parish pastor is in recognizing these problems. Respondents were asked to rate nine problem areas of student concern in the order of their importance. The nine problems listed which might be expected to plague students are suggested by English and Pearson. They are: emotional, vocation, educational, social, health, economic, moral and spiritual, marriage, and family and alcohol.[1] A blank was left for the listing of additional problem areas. Some difficulty was experienced in evaluating these data. It was necessary to weigh the nebulous quality of the data, and it was necessary to determine the accuracy of the records kept by the pastors. It seemed impossible to divide up the emotions, the spirit, and the body into such a set of clear-cut categories. Systems by which pastors file their counseling records vary so much that a degree of non-conformity is suspected in their reporting of these matters.

Since problem areas in this system of grouping appear to intermingle, perhaps they should be conceived more as a galaxy than as a series of sharply designated autonomous units. Taking all of the above into consideration, tabulation of data revealed that moral and spiritual problems are the number one area of student concern.

The second most serious difficulty creating anxiety among students today centers around emotional problems, and the third most prevalent problem plaguing the student mind is vocational. Other

---

[1] English and Pearson, Emotional Problem of Living (New York: W. S. Norton, Inc., 1945), pp. 163-292.

problem areas which respondents indicated are a constant source of concern, in descending order of their value, were scored as follows: educational problems, marriage and family problems, economic problems, social problems, alcohol and health problems. Additional problem areas which pastors think should be included were noted on the margin of this question. "Campus adjustments" and "sex" were listed twice, and the following were noted once: "military service," "popularity," "discipline," and "Catholic vs. Protestant."

The method of scoring by which the above ratings are established merits mention. With nine problems of concern and the possibility of nine choices, the ninth choice was evaluated at one point, the eighth choice was evaluated at two points, the seventh three and so on up to first choice which was evaluated at nine points. The choices in each problem area were then multiplied by their respective evaluations. The same procedure was followed with the remaining eight problem areas. Then when the sum of the total points for each problem area was determined, the result obtained was scored as follows: moral and spiritual problems, 1514 points; emotional problems, 1464 points; vocational problems, 1214 points; educational problems, 1057 points; marriage and family problems, 1028 points; economic problems, 877 points; social problems, 750 points; alcohol, 620 points; and health problems, 595 points. A few problems noted on the margin of the questionnaire were so negligible in point valuation that they were not rated. Again, let it be said that these figures must not be pushed to the point of mathematical precision.

Because emotional problems rank second is no reason to suggest that to a student they are secondary. Who knows the fine line that separates the spiritual from the emotional--if indeed the co-mingling isn't so ethereal as to be non-existent? And if emotional problems are so intermeshed with spiritual problems how can the parish priest be pastor and physician enough to diagnose the difference so that he can treat the one, and, if necessary, refer the other to a competent medical practitioner? These are other reasons why he needs more formal training that he appears to possess, so that he can counsel more effectively in this area of emotional anxiety. The fact that vocational problems run a close third to emotional disturbances is not surprising to the university parish pastor who realizes that the later-adolescent is at an age which is highly concerned about making a living. Also, it is natural that educational problems should rank high on the campus of an educational institution.

Although Waldo Beach concludes that excessive drinking is the number one moral problem on the contemporary campus,[1] and Selden and Bacon estimate that 74 per cent of all students on college campuses drink,[2] figures returned by pastors in answer to this poll do not confirm these judgments. In fact, alcohol rates next to last as a problem area of students concerned in this study. This could indicate one or both of two things: (a) alcohol is not a major problem of the

---

[1]Waldo Beach, Conscience on Campus (New York: Association Press, 1958), p. 19.

[2]Robert Straus and Selden Bacon, Drinking in College (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1953), p. 46.

students counselled by Methodist university parish pastors, or (b) these pastors are ignorant of the true status of the drinking problem on the campus.

Contradicting a presumed higher rating for economic and health problems are the relatively low places that these problem areas occupy in our findings. That economic problems should rank sixth bespeaks a growing rate of prosperity among the middle class families whence a majority of these students come. And that health problems rank last leads to conjecture that the problems of the spirit outweigh the predicaments of the flesh in the life of the contemporary student.

6. Referring for Professional Treatment

Granting that college pastors ought to be able to spot students with emotional disturbances who need professional treatment so that they can refer them for physical, psychological or psychiatric care, in question 8 the writer endeavored to discover what these pastors are doing in this area of counseling.

A total of thirty-four or 16 per cent of the respondents reported that they were doing considerable referring when it appeared to be essential; 127 or 57 per cent of the pastors declared that they were doing some referring; fifty-seven or 25 per cent said that they never referred; and six or 3 per cent failed to mark the question. From this tabulation it appears that about three-fourths of the pastors, or 72 per cent, make some attempt at referring. Whether more of the pastors could do a more effective job of referring students for

professional care if they were more skilled in the art of simple diagnosis is not clear, but observation of data in hand leads one to suspect that more referring would be done if pastors were better trained in this aspect of counseling, and/or if professional services were more available and less expensive.

The national pattern as to the proportion of pastors who refer some as to those who refer considerably holds true throughout the respective jurisdictions, with one exception; namely, fewer pastors report no referring in the West than in any other area.

A North Central preacher who confers with a number of psychiatrists about students is an excellent example of what is being done by some of the pastors in this field. A Southwestern minister states that when he runs into a student problem in counseling which indicates the need for referring he talks with the university counseling staff to get added guidance. A Western pastor reports that his church is seriously considering setting up a professional counseling service to students to augment service that is available at the university.

Examination of data indicates that more and more pastors are recognizing their limitations in counseling difficult cases and are learning the art of referring. In this connection a Southeastern pastor warns, "The average university pastor should always recognize his counseling limitations."

7. Special Training for Professional Referring

Two questions were asked relative to formal or specialized

training for counseling by the pastors on the field. Reports to questions 9 and 10 which deal with this matter are summarized herewith:

a) Kind of specialized training: Question 9 dealt with the kind of specialized training the pastors had which enabled them to recognize symptoms indicating a need for professional referring. Respondents were asked to indicate how much training they had--whether "considerable," "some," or "none."

Twenty-eight, or 13 per cent, reported that they had considerable formal training; 118, or 53 per cent, said that they had some training; and seventy-seven, or 34 per cent, confessed that they had no training. About ten per cent more pastors answered affirmatively on this question than they did on question 8. Returns on this question were uniformly distributed throughout the jurisdictions.

Some between-the-line comments merit mention. For example, a Western pastor says that he has taken courses in pastoral counseling and that he has had clinical training in a mental hospital. Another Westerner says that he is a trained marriage counselor. Possessing a doctorate in that field, he states that he is a member of the American Association of Marriage Counselors.

Many Ohio pastors enroll semi-annually in a five-day course in pastoral counseling offered by a professional staff at a state university on an interdenominational basis. They attend monthly meetings in the interim. Similar courses are open to pastors in an interdenominational level at the Community Church of Columbus, Ohio, under the leadership of Dr. Roy Burkhart and a staff of trained leaders.

One Northeastern pastor has been a federal chaplain. Another Northeasterner has done social service work as a member of a probation association. Another pastor from this area has had a year of training with a psychiatrist. This helps him to detect serious emotional disturbances among his parishioners so that he can make intelligent referrals. And another Northeasterner has done some criminal and juvenile court work which he feels helps him in this area of ministry to students.

A South Central pastor majored in sociology, clinical and educational psychology and counseling in completing requirements for his Ph. D. degree. One Southeasterner has had experience as a pharmacist's mate in a United States Navy mental ward while doing military service. Another from the same area has specialized in psychology and has taken accredited courses under Wayne Oates and other recognized leaders in the field of counseling. Additional specialized training reported by pastors is summarized as follows: clinical observation and training in a mental hospital, twenty-one; seminary courses and seminars in clinical observation, eighteen; hospital and prison chaplains, six; psychiatric interviews on an analytical level, four; and mental health clinics,two. Special training that proved helpful was reported in these areas: marriage counseling seminar, school for boys, medical school classes, and attendance at Yale School for Alcohol Studies. Two North Central pastors employ professional psychiatrists who serve on their church counseling staffs in the interest of students.

b) Clinical Counseling: The final question on page four dealt with a request for information regarding clinical counseling done by the pastors under supervision. While returns to this question somewhat overlap returns from the previous question, a summary of these data revealed forty "Yes" votes, as against 183 "No" choices. This tabulation indicates that only 18 per cent, or about one in five, have had any clinical counseling experience at all. The best record is shown by the Western Jurisdiction which indicated one "Yes" answer for each 2.5 "No" answers. The poorest record in this area of counseling is reported by Southeastern which tabulated only six pastors who claimed some clinical experience, and by South Central which had only two preachers who had done any clinical counseling under supervision.

A number of replies were received in answer to question 10a which invited respondents to describe this clinical training. Replies are exemplified in the following illustrations. A North Central pastor who has been preaching for eleven years, four of which have been at his one college assignment, states:

> While in seminary I had a year's training at a Veteran's Administration mental hospital. It was directed by the hospital chaplain and involved the psychiatrist, psychologist, social worker, etc. I received seminary credit for the work.

A Southeastern pastor reports that his experience as a professional case worker with a Family Service Society has been helpful. A Northeastern minister says that he received help while learning counseling skills as a member of the state Youth Authority Committee of Kentucky.

A Northeastern college preacher notes that he followed this schedule while doing clinical observation and counseling under the supervision of the head chaplain of a Boston mental hospital:

> We had two one hour sessions daily with the head chaplain and the other counselors, and three to four hours every afternoon in the wards counseling patients, with written verbatim reports required.

B. Summary

This chapter has contributed depth to the portrait of our typical university parish pastor. It established the fact that whether he is adequately trained or not he tries to serve students through the medium of personal counseling. The chances are about five to four that he spends considerable time in this activity as compared with a casual pursuit of this function. If he lives in the midwest he does more counseling than if he labors elsewhere in the nation.

He averages 3.4 hours per week of counseling with students and he is not fully convinced that he should publish the hours of his availability as a counselor. There appears to be correlation between the amount and quality of his counseling and the amount of specialized training that he has had. There is also an evident relationship between his counseling and the length of time he has spent at a college parish.

The typical university parish pastor is more willing to structure counseling situations with students than not, although frequently he does so without conscious attempt at deliberately doing so. He thinks that

his preaching produces more personal interviews than any other single activity on his part. However, he feels that participating in student activities and just being available together produce nearly as many counseling situations as his preaching.

He is more likely to use a combination of counseling methods than to employ any single method. When he uses a single method of counseling he finds that he has more success with the non-directive or reflective style than with any other single method. Just listening is his second most effective fashion of conducting personal interviews, and the giving of advice is recognized as the least valid method.

The university pastor feels that moral and spiritual problems rank highest of the areas that vitally concern college students. Emotional, vocational, educational, marital and family, social, alcohol, and health problems rate next in order of importance.

The typical pastor is more inclined than not to refer students who are in need of professional physical or mental treatment to physicians who are skilled in therapy. This score would undoubtedly be higher if qualified professional help were always available and less expensive.

He may or may not have had some formal or specialized training for the recognizing of symptoms of emotional disturbances which aid him in referring, but such training is usually limited. The chances are about one to five that he has done some clinical counseling under supervision, and if he has had such training he is twice as likely to labor in the West than in any other area.

Data returned here indicate that in general the older a pastor becomes past a certain age and the closer he comes to retirement, the less inclined he is to reinforce his technical counseling skills with additional specialized training. This study cannot explore this conclusion deeply enough to document it as fact, but evidence pointing in that direction is strong.

As data for this chapter pass through the hands of the tabulator he gets a feeling that some pastors are not trying very hard in this area of endeavor either because (1) they don't realize the importance of this arm of their ministry to the campus, (2) they don't know how to counsel, or (3) they are too busy meeting other demands of their parish ministry to be able to do much about counseling. But the men who are working at it are doing the best they can with what training and experience they possess. There are evidences here that the entire area of counseling, although intriguingly full of limitless possibilities, is still very new, and because its procedures are in experimental stages the average pastor fears to venture out boldly.

The observer concludes that many pastors have not become proficient in the fundamentals of acceptable pastoral counseling. They are good speakers, but traditionally the preacher has been a poor listener. They have a "hunch" that they ought to be doing more counseling than they have been doing and that they ought to be doing it better. They appear to be very much interested in the field of counseling, but most of them give the impression that they are beginners.

If the typical university parish pastor is forty-five years of age and has been preaching for eighteen years, when he attended seminary the theory of counseling as a well-developed department in theological schools was in its infancy. If he speaks truthfully he will probably tell you that because of the press of the Methodist system and the daily demands made upon him by the pastoral ministry he has had little opportunity to keep up with the many books which have been written recently in this field and with the rapid advance that has been made in the realm of clinical counseling. Therefore, when the average parish pastor at a college situation ventures very far into counseling he appears to realize that he is in "deep water."

A review of material summarized in this chapter presents a dual challenge to the university parish pastor in the interest of improved counseling of college students: (1) a plea for more specialized training in clinical counseling and enrollment in specialized courses which are offered at seminaries, clinics, hospitals and centers across the nation at special seasons of the year; and (2) a demand for longer pastorates at university parishes and more years of consecutive service for men who serve near-campus churches acceptably.

The following chapter will deal with examination of data returned concerning the teaching function of the university parish pastor.

dynamics of general progressive education which he feels he needs to fulfill the requirements of this function; and (4) measurement of legal complaints of all kinds which have been received across the nation regarding religious activities at the scenes of respective campuses.

It should be pointed out that the above listing of areas of inquiry to which this section of the study is arbitrarily limited does not include reference to the teaching function of the pulpit or to the natural didacticism which is inherent in informal discussion groups conducted by the pastor. These are by no means to be considered as fringe elements of teaching and there would be no desire on the part of the writer to have them appear secondary. A part of this matter has been assumed under the chapter on Preaching; some of it is implied under (2) of the above listing; and (like our previous assumption that other fundamental functions such as conducting funerals, performing the sacraments, and pastoral calling automatically continue in the routine of the university parish pastor as he ministers to a "whole" community) it is assumed that these other important teaching functions of said pastor are taken for granted. Of necessity questions in the instrument had to be limited. But in establishing such limitations the larger aspects of the functions involved are not to be ignored. Let us now examine tabulated results from the first of the four areas selected for measuring:

1. Teaching of Courses

Data in this area are divided into two classifications; namely, (1) pastors who teach accredited courses in religion, and (2) pastors who teach any kind of a class or group which is open to students. A summary of what is going on in this area may be gained by observing Table 30.

TABLE 30

PASTORS TEACHING COURSES OR GROUPS

Jurisdiction	Pastors who teach credit courses	Per cent	Pastors who teach other groups	Per cent
Western	6	17.1	13	37.1
North Central	8	13.5	13	22.0
Northeastern	4	11.1	8	22.4
South Central	15	33.0	18	40.0
Southeastern	13	26.5	17	34.6
Totals	46	20.5[a]	69	30.8[a]

[a]Average of percentages

a) Teaching accredited courses in religion: According to Table 30 there were forty-six pastors who reported the teaching of courses in religion for which students receive credit, for an involvement of 20 per cent of the pastors covered by this study. The table signifies

that a greater number of pastors in the South engaged in this activity. South Central has three times as many preachers teaching courses for credit as Northeastern. These two jurisdictions represent the extremes of data returned. North Central is not far above Northeastern in the percentage of teaching pastors, and Western strikes a medium between high and low.

These figures lead one to suspect that the South enjoys more leniency and freedom in interpretation of legal restrictions of church and state regulations as they apply to religion in higher education. Also, in the Northeast there appears to be some basis for correlation between the low percentage of pastors in that area who teach for credit and the uniform poor response from that area in several aspects of this total study.

At this juncture one wonders whether more pastors throughout the nation would teach such courses if they had more formal training. Forty-five individual comments were provoked by question 1a, which invited pastors to explain about "which pastors are teaching what courses under what kind of an arrangement" with school administrations. These replies described a number of different kinds of working arrangements with respective administrations by which they taught their classes.

A review of some of these replies will be helpful. At one Western school local pastors who possess graduate degrees are invited to offer courses in religion on an interdenominational basis. One course per quarter is offered for three hours credit, and the teaching is done on a rotation basis. Recently the following courses have been offered by

the following teachers: "Reason and Religion" by a Roman Catholic, "Church History Survey" by a Methodist, "Christian Ethics" by an Episcopalian, "Life of Jesus" by a Baptist, "Old Testament" by a Lutheran, "New Testament" by a United Brethren, and "The Ecumenical Movement" by a Presbyterian. Arizona State University has an Interdenominational Institute with credit courses in religion integrated with the college curriculum. A Western pastor states that the University of California refuses to give credit for such courses. A Montana pastor reports that a Methodist college chaplain in his city teaches Bible, Church History, Christian Education and Philosophy of Religion. A pastor at the Methodist parish church at Oregon State College states that he has taught courses for credit in Church History, the Old Testament Prophets, and the Life of Jesus.

Six comments came from the North Central area where, among others, a Jewish rabbi, and an Episcopalian rector teach credit courses in Hebrew and Church History, respectively. At the university of Toledo the professor of religion is an ordained minister who serves full time on the faculty. Three comments came from the Northeastern Jurisdiction where an Episcopal curate teaches a course in religion at Goucher College, a Baptist pastor teaches "The Life of Jesus" at a Central New York school, and Moravian pastors teach eight hours of religion at a Pennsylvania Moravian College. Only one Methodist pastor reported teaching any kind of a credit course in the Northeast. Among the thirteen pastors commenting from South Central a total of

eight Methodist ministers report teaching classes for credit in connection with college curricula. At a Texas Agricultural College the local Wesley Foundation Director, an ordained pastor, teaches Bible on the campus for credit. At an independent university in Wichita Falls, Texas, there is a regular arrangement for a Bible chair with Methodist, Christian, Baptist, and Episcopal pastors teaching religion for credit.

The Southeast contributed fifteen comments about teaching arrangements of pastors for regular college credit. At one college qualified pastors are invited to take turns teaching courses in religion. A Jewish rabbi teaches Old Testament at a Florida university. At a Tennessee State college a retired Baptist minister teaches Bible courses. At the University of Tennessee there is a school of religion that operates under a special charter as an educational institution with its own board of trustees which is representative of the following supporting groups: Christian, Methodist, Church of Christ, Lutheran, Episcopal, Presbyterian, and Southern Baptist. Fifteen courses are offered during the academic year. Credit for up to eighteen hours in religion is allowed. The ministerial teachers must have the approval of their denominations, the University trustees and the school administration. The Bachelor of Divinity degree is the minimum scholastic requirement.

b) Teaching courses or groups of any kind without credit:

Because the teaching of accredited courses in religion does not cover all the opportunities for the fulfillment of the requirements of the teaching function as practiced by the ideal university parish pastor, returns of data from question (2), which inquired as to the teaching of any kind of a student group (i.e., courses without accreditation), were tabulated next.

The right hand columns of Table 30 reveal that the number of pastors teaching in this category in every jurisdiction except one is more than double the number of those who teach for credit, and in the Northeastern area this number is practically tripled. It is significant that the poorer showing made in Northeastern returns from question 7 are somewhat compensated by the better proportionate scoring here. The best showing in the nation again is made by the South Central area, and a significant increase is shown in the Western Jurisdiction.

It should be emphasized that in separating the returns of this section into two categories no inference is implied that one type of teaching is necessarily more important than the other. It has been pointed out that in some states because of legal restrictions it is considered difficult for the parish pastor to teach religion in connection with the college curriculum. In this case the opportunity for him to teach courses or groups in his church and on the periphore of the campus for which credit is not received is always open to him. Such teaching is of major importance and should be weighed in relation

to the results of his total teaching program in the university community. This presents an opportunity to the pastor to teach basic beliefs of the Christian faith, in view of the rising general interest in theology among laymen as well as among students. Whether he teaches this course with or without credit is not material.

There are recognized authorities who declare that the teaching of non-credit courses by the university parish pastor is of much more value, in the final analysis, than any teaching of credit courses that he might offer as a recognized member of a university faculty. Granted in some instances that ground breaking may be done for credit course work on the university level by the local pastor who is academically qualified, yet the academic teaching function belongs to the trained university teacher and not to the pastor.

The fact that nearly one in three pastors is engaged in some form of teaching endeavor is revealing. It bespeaks a creditable showing on the part of the 30.8 per cent of the preachers who are fulfilling this phase of the requirements posed for the ideal university parish pastor, but it also leads one to wonder what the other two-thirds of the pastors might be doing in this area if they had more time, training, inclination and experience.

Several personal comments were volunteered in response to question 2a which reveal the creative work being done by some men in the field who teach classes or groups without credit. Characteristic samplings of these replies are cited as follows: Several reported

teaching classes for Church Membership which are open to students. A Southeastern pastor teaches a course in "Methodism" at a Disciples of Christ Bible college. A South Central pastor teaches Philosophy of Religion at a Moravian college. Another South Central Methodist pastor teaches Social Hygiene and substitutes in the department of religion, and another conducts a course in "Theological Issues" on a non-credit basis. A Southeasterner and a South Central pastor teach courses in Courtship and Marriage. A Western pastor conducts a class for nine students who desire a Methodist Local Preacher's License. Another westerner holds informal religious discussion with students at coffee time, and another seeks to teach religion through the use of religious Drama.

2. Laboratory-Experience in Churchmanship

In questions 3 through 6 the writer attempted to discover ways in which the university parish church is or is not providing a laboratory-experience for training students in churchmanship so that they will be able to make a positive contribution to Kingdom work when they return to their home communities. Thus it is hoped that students will receive practical experience and guidance in becoming the Church within the world. Interest in these questions was sufficient to indicate that the provision of such a teaching opportunity at the campus church merits a great deal of consideration by the pastor in charge. Observation of data returned in response to these four questions will be weighed next.

a) Training in churchmanship: A total of 101 or 45 per cent of the pastors in the nation indicated that they offered some sort of laboratory-experience as a learning opportunity for student participation. Jurisdictionally it appears that the best opportunity for such lessons in churchmanship are offered in the West which rates a score of 51.5 per cent of its campus parish churches involved in this training. The least opportunity for this training is offered in the Southeast at a score of 34.6 per cent. The other three areas rank uniformly at about 47 per cent each. Examination of these figures leads one to suspect that in the Southeast a preaching-centered program may be emphasized at the expense of learning through participation.

Comments from pastors regarding this form of teaching churchmanship vary. For example, some churches simply give a general invitation. When they enlist leadership with the understanding that students are included in the general invitation. Other churches make a specific point of inviting certain students to identify themselves with the local church program in specific ways, like the Southeastern pastor who states, "This is our total purpose." One Western pastor finds his students "too busy" to try to enlist them, and another from the same area states that the entire program of the Wesley Foundation performs this function for his local church. Several in the South describe programs of deputation teams which visit smaller churches in the area to carry a gospel message, and by so-doing they learn churchmanship.

In a Louisiana parish community centers throughout the city are used as laboratories by the Sociology department of the local college. This becomes a learning situation for students involved.

b) Teacher-training courses: In response to question 4, which asked pastors to report whether local churches offered teacher-training courses in which students were invited to participate in a learning situation, a total of 107 or forty-seven per cent of the pastors replied in the affirmative. This is a higher score than was tallied by returns to question 3.

The percentages at the opposite poles of jurisdiction variation, however, are reversed. The Southeast, which rated poorest in question 3, showed the highest rating or 53 per cent in question 4. The West, which ranked first in question 3, revealed the lowest score or 34.4 per cent in returns for question 4. The remaining three jurisdictions were uniformly grouped between 47 and 51 per cent, within a range of four per cent.

The comment of a South Central pastor is characteristic of the feeling of some of the pastors about this question when he states, "We offer such courses in teacher-training, but not too many of the students feel they can take time from their studies at college to participate."

c) Student activity in the local church: So that some idea might be gained as to the kind of activity in which university parish churches invite student participation and the degree to which the students

respond, question 5 was directed at six areas of local church activity offering in-service training in churchmanship.

The categories selected for measuring are general in nature and returns from any single one of them might produce nebulous findings. But when data returned from all of them are studied in relation to one another, their corporate findings provide a fairly accurate indication of how the parish pastor is helping to discharge his responsibility to Methodist students through this medium of teaching. Table 31 summarizes this student participation in the local church on a national scale.

TABLE 31

HOW STUDENTS PARTICIPATE IN CHURCH ACTIVITIES

	Considerable		Some		None	
Activities	Number	Per cent	Number	Per cent	Number	Per cent
Church school teaching . . .	24	10.7	146	65.2	54	24.1
Substitute teaching . . .	21	9.4	144	64.3	59	26.3
Church school officer . . .	10	4.5	57	25.5	157	70.0
Sing in choir	102	25.5	94	42.0	28	12.5
Ushering	32	14.3	92	41.0	100	44.7
Helping in Sunday services	49	21.9	121	54.0	54	24.1

Table 31 reveals that more students across the nation are engaged in "some" local church activities than participate in "considerable" activities, with the exception of singing in the chancel choir. In

the latter category about 10 per cent more fall within the "considerable" grouping than within the "some" classification.

A combining of the "considerable" and the "some" categories, representing a total of all participation on the part of students in local church activities (as against the total percentages in the "none" category), adds meaning to these data. When such a sum of the first two categories is studied, singing in the chancel choir appears to be the most popular activity in which students engage. Those who teach in the church school, those who do substitute teaching in the church school, and those who participate in Sunday morning worship services rank about even in a three-way tie for the second-place-activity. Serving as ushers ranks next, and "church school officer" shows up poorly.

A glance at the negative implication of these data emphasizes their poor showing. It reveals, for example, that approximately one in four churches reports no student teaching or substitute teaching in the church school and no participation in the worship services. And more than half of the churches never employ students as ushers.

Variations from the national norm which are conspicuous in respect to the separate jurisdictions are noted as follows: (1) there is little variation in regard to church school teaching; and (2) the Southern areas report a higher concentration of students in the "considerable" category who sing in the choir, usher, and help with Sunday services than are listed in the "some" category of the same activities--as over against participation in the same activities

in the other three jurisdictions. This observation suggests that more students in the South are employed in church activities which relate to the preaching services in contrast to those who do the work of teaching in the church school, than anywhere else in the nation.

Additional activities of student participation which pastors named in the "other" category were not numerous, but some of them merit listing because they indicate peculiar and valuable contributions to Kingdom work not only in service rendered but in the training in churchmanship which is involved. They included: providing recreational leadership for church functions (four), participating in all-student choir (four), youth group advisers (three), conducting Sunday evening services and public forums (three), deputation teams (three), church secretarial and office work (two), conducting worship at hospitals and rest homes (two), assisting in annual church bazaar and dinner (two) and choir and dramatics leader (two).

The following activities were listed once, but they are no less important because each suggests a valuable activity for student participation; helping with every member canvass, calling with visitation-evangelism teams, serving as members on all of the Commissions of the Official Board, conducting junior church, nursery helper, baby-sitter for church functions, Sunday greeters, helping with Family-night, and Christmas decorations. All pastors reporting the use of deputation teams reside in the South, suggesting a greater emphasis on this type of training for churchmanship in this area as contrasted with the rest of the nation.

d) Students on Official Board: Granted that membership on the Official Board of the local parish church can provide excellent learning experience in the art of churchmanship for students, upon enquiring in question 6 as to how many students held such board membership in the respective college churches, data were received and tabulated as illustrated in Table 32.

TABLE 32

STUDENT OFFICIAL BOARD MEMBERS

Jurisdiction	Pastors reporting some	Number of Board members	Pastors reporting none	Pastors not reporting
Western	23	42	0	12
North Central	28	72	5	26
Northeastern	15	21	1	20
South Central	20	51	1	24
Southeastern	12	41	4	33
Totals	98	233	11	115

With ninety-eight pastors reporting a total of 233 students who are members of their respective Official Boards, the national average figured slightly more than one Board member per church. Of the pastors who reported "some," the South Central area leads the jurisdictions in percentage, with North Central, Western, Southeastern and Northeastern

following in order. North Central and Southeastern lead in the number of pastors reporting no students on their Official Boards.

Of perhaps greater significance is the contrasting right hand column of Table 32 which tabulated 115 of the pastors in the nation not reporting one way or another on this question. One would assume that because of their silence in this matter they ought to be classified with the pastors reporting in the "none" category. Thus, the sum of the "no reporting" and the "none" categories represents a total of 126 or 56 per cent of the pastors in the nation who indicate that they have no members of their student groups serving as Official Board members.

Included in this number Southeastern leads the country with 70 per cent of its pastors reporting no student Board members; second place in this tabulating goes to the Northeast with 58 per cent reporting none; third place is accorded to South Central with 53.3 per cent; North Central is close behind with 52.5 per cent; and the best showing is made by Western with 34.2 per cent.

Capacities in which these students serve on the Official Board other than as presidents of their respective student groups and the number of times they were listed are noted as follows: member of Education Commission (seventeen), member of Missions Commission (fourteen), member of Finance Commission (ten), member of Membership and Evangelism Commission (nine), Steward (eight), Local Preacher (five), adviser to Methodist Youth Fellowship (three), member of the Pastoral Relations Committee (one), member of the Local Church Activities Committee (one), member of the Commission on Christian Social Relations (one), member of the Building Committee (one), choir president (one), trustee (one), and chairman of deputation teams (one). One served as the vice-chairman of the Official

Board, and eight pastors reported that their policy was to name a student on every Commission of the Official Board. A lone North Central pastor confesses, "We have sought students as members of our Official Board, but with poor results."

3. Knowledge of the Principles of Education

In tabulating returns from the third general block of questions on page 5 of the questionnaire, which were concerned with the parish pastor's estimation of how much fundamental knowledge of the principles of education he needs for acceptably fulfilling the demands of his job at a university situation, data were classified under two headings: (1) religious education, and (2) general progressive education. Table 33 graphically displays a summary of the findings of question 7 and 8.

TABLE 33

ESTIMATES OF REQUIRED KNOWLEDGE OF EDUCATION

Questions[a]	Percent considerable	Per cent some	Per cent none
7. How much knowledge of Religious Education and Psychology of Religion is needed by pastors? . .	81.5	18.5	0.0
8. How much knowledge of general progressive education is needed by pastors?	59.0	39.1	1.9

[a]The identifying numbers refer to questions on the questionnaire. See Appendix A. p. 525.

a) Knowledge of the principles of Religious Education: According to returns from question 7, as visualized in Table 33, all pastors felt that some fundamental knowledge of the principles of Religious Education and the Psychology of Religion were essential for acceptably fulfilling requirements of the teaching function of their ministry to students. But there was difference in the degree of such knowledge considered necessary. Those who thought that "considerable" knowledge was more important outnumbered those who considered that "some" knowledge was enough background in this area by about four to one. This same ratio was predominant in the Western, North and South Central areas. The lowest proportion was found in the North Central area with a three to one ratio. The highest variation from the norm was reported by Southeastern where the ratio was five to one.

b) Knowledge of the principles of general education: According to returns from question 8, also summarized in Table 33, most pastors felt that at least some fundamental knowledge of the dynamics and principles of general progressive education were essential for fulfilling requirements of the teaching function of their ministry to students. A small proportion of less than two per cent of the pastors thought that this general background knowledge was unnecessary, but among those who considered that some knowledge was necessary there was a difference in feeling about the degree of knowledge required. Those who thought that "considerable" knowledge in this area was more important outnumbered those who considered that "some" knowledge was enough by the ratio of three to two. Comparing and contrasting data received from the separate jurisdictions show that North Central and South Central conform to the national

norm by a three to two ratio; that Western and Northeastern figure a two to one proportion; and that in the Southeastern area "considerable" ranks practically on a par with the "some" category.

A comparison of figures tallied for questions 7 and 8 in Table 33 indicate little difference in opinion of pastors regarding the desirability of at least "some" knowledge of the principles of Religious Education and general educational theory. But there is a significant difference evident in their reaction as to whether there ought to be more than "some" knowledge of one or the other. A total of 23 per cent more pastors thought that there ought to be "considerable" knowledge of Religious Education and the Psychology of Religion than pastors who thought that there ought to be "considerable" knowledge of general educational procedure. This evidence provides sufficient grounds to warrant the assumption that knowledge of the subject matter to be taught is more important than educational theory. Since there was no direct invitation issued to share creative thinking on this matter, there were no special comments of any kind regarding this question volunteered between the lines.

4. Legal Complaints About Religious Activities

Returns from question 9 were classified under three headings: (1) as to whether recent legal complaints had been received from any student, faculty member, or community person regarding any religious activity of any kind carried on at the campus of a related school; (2) as to whether such objections had been raised several times or not; and (3) as to a description of these complaints and what happened concerning them. Data from the three parts of this question will be examined separately.

a) Complaints on legal grounds: Table 34 presents a visual summary of data received from the first part of question 9. It summarizes returns from this question under two categories, according to jurisdictional as well as nation-percentages. This dual method of accounting gives deeper perspective to data than deploying only one or the other. Merely stating that there were seventeen objections raised across the nation does not pinpoint returns enough to make them objective. One wonders, "Where were these objections raised?"; "Who raised the complaints?"; and "Did their particular geographical or sociological backgrounds have anything to do with the number or severity of the complaints?"

TABLE 34

COMPLAINTS ON LEGAL GROUNDS BY JURISDICTIONS

Jurisdiction	Number of complaints received lately	Jurisdictional percentage	National percentage
Western	6	17.1	2.68
North Central	3	5.1	1.34
Northeastern	4	11.1	1.78
South Central	3	6.7	1.34
Southeastern	1	2.5	0.34
Total	17	-----	-----

Table 34 shows that most of the "incidents" took place in the West, the least number took place in the Southeast, and Northeastern is credited with the second highest number of "incidents." Also, a comparision of jurisdictional and national percentages in this table reveals an apparent correlation between both columns in the Southeastern, Western and Northeastern areas. Whereas South Central is tied with North Central for third place in national percentage, South Central ranks 1.6 per cent above North Central in jurisdictional percentage.

A study of those data leads one towards the making of one or both of two assumptions about the Southeast. With only one complaint cited from that entire area one is inclined to conclude either that pastors from that jurisdiction were careless in reporting or that there is a high degree of tolerance of religious activities and/or that legal restrictions are not as rigidly interpreted in that area as they are in other sectors of the country. The South has never known the formal regard for separation of church and state that prevails in the west and in the midwest.

By the same process of rationalizing it might be assumed that pastors in the West were more accurate reporters, and/or that legal restrictions are more stringent and that there is a lower degree of tolerance in that section relative to matters of church and state. Perhaps there is correlation between the traditionally accepted higher proportion of identification of the population in the South with the church and the evident high tolerance of religious activity

on school campuses in that area as contrasted with the lower proportion of identification of people in the west with the church and the evident low tolerance of religious activities on school campuses in that area. Although the South traditionally appears to be more tolerant of religious teaching on campuses, the writer wonders whether there would not have been more protests from this area if the teaching of issues like racial equality or Biblical liberalism were prominent.

According to Table 34, throughout the midwest (the North and South Central areas) a proverbial "happy medium" obtains relative to this serious question with which religion in higher education is concerned.

b) The number of objections. It seemed important to the writer to press this question so that the observer might be able to sift the minor objections from the major complaints. Obviously, if most of the complaints were seldom repeated and then only in a calm manner, there would not be enough "sparks in the ashes" to warrant alarm. But, on the other hand, if there should prove to be serious ground for suspecting that this matter might be a smoldering bonfire waiting to be fanned into a flame, then the problem should be recognized by the local parish pastor. In question 9a the writer sought to determine the degree of severity of the complaints as judged according to the number of times they were received and how loudly they echoed and reverberated. It appears to the observer that a large majority of the seventeen complaints what were reported nationwide were genuine objections and that they assumed the proportion of major complaints because of the number of

times they were made and the loudness with which they were vociferated. Illustrative of the feeling of pastors who reported concerning this matter are personal comments volunteered from the jurisdictions and which are summarized herewith.

c) Description of complaints. The third part of this question asked respondents to describe these complaints and what happened concerning them. Several comments were made on the reverse side of this page of the questionnaire which become valuable to the analysis of what is going on in this area relative to the parish pastor's teaching opportunity.

The Western Jurisdiction replied with nine comments which ranged from six complaints against the practice to two comments which stated that no particular problem exists. In four Western Schools Religious Emphasis Weeks were ruled off the campus because of a strict application of laws concerning the separation of church and state. Among these the American Civil Liberties Union was instrumental in having the practice banned at the University of Washington. As a result of this decision the Attorney General ruled out the practice of Religious Emphasis Week at another Washington state college. The American Civil Liberties Union put on pressure to abide by the state constitution which is reported to prohibit the custom. However, YMCA and YWCA offices continue to function in the student union building at the activities center, but with some apprehension that they may be outlawed in the future. At one Western school so many complaints were raised against the use of campus facilities for

religious student activities that as a result the Roman Catholics built a Newman House for their youth off campus.

North Central registered three complaints, but none of these were as serious as those reported by the West. At one school the university administration refused any longer to allow religious-preference cards to be handled by university personnel during registration of students, but in the future the Religious Workers Association of all the churches will be allowed to perform this function. One North Central university which is very new reported an unsure administration which has a vague idea as to the proper relation of religious groups to the institution. Hence it restricts group meetings on the campus and publicity about student religious activities otherwise. A pastor at the scene of Wisconsin State College reported that the Newman Club meets on school property in apparent violation of regulations, and the administration does nothing about it.

In the Northeast one dean felt that no denominations should have special meetings on the campus of a state college, but he has left the school. At another Northeastern school objections were raised several times to activities of a sectarian nature as administered by a Student Christian Association, but the pastor failed to report the outcome of this series of complaints. Perhaps the most serious of the objections in the Northeast came from Unitariam and Jewish sources at a New York State Teachers College because office space on the campus was contributed for the use of counselors and

chaplains of the major faiths. The local pastor stated that this was referred to counsel for the state and that the state gave the opinion that the objection should be sustained. But permission was granted to establish an "interview room" which might be used at the request of students "for religious or other inquiry."

Interracial meetings in the name of religion have been denounced by some students, faculty members and community people at a South Central campus, but nothing has been done about it. At another South Central campus the Jewish group felt that Religious Emphasis Week violated the principle of separation of church and state, but no formal action was taken resultant to protests. An Oklahoma pastor says that state law prohibits formal religious activities on the campuses of that state and that one school which permits the teaching of certain types of religious courses probably will be forced to cease this practice. The president of a Nebraska State Teachers college frowns upon the practice of a Religious Emphasis Week on his campus. However, plans are under way to schedule a Brotherhood Day, whereby Protestant, Roman Catholic, and Jewish leaders will be brought in to speak. The college administration at this school feels that there is something in the state constitution that makes it difficult to conduct a Religious Emphasis Week. The Southeastern Jurisdiction seems to be the most tolerant in this matter, with only a single pastor reporting "We have had some trouble, but our problem is on a local basis only."

B. Summary

A review of data analyzed in this chapter relative to the teaching function of the college pastor adds perspective to the portrait of the typical university parish pastor.

In regard to his obligation to serve students through a teaching ministry, we have found that the leading character of this study stands one chance in five of teaching some sort of course in religion for credit at the scene of his related campus, and that he is 30 per cent inclined to teach some other kind of an organized group in which students may participate without opportunity for credit.

There is a 50 per cent chance that he will offer students an opportunity to learn churchmanship through invited participation in religious activity in the local church. If he lives in the West he is more inclined to be of this opinion than if he labors in the Southeast. On the other hand, if he resides in the Southeast he is more apt to make some sort of teacher-training instruction available to his student group.

The typical university parish pastor has a pronounced leaning toward inviting student participation in activities of the local church which require little or no preparation or training. He has one member of his student group serving on the Official Board. Normally this member is the official representative of the student group. The student who serves on the Official Board is usually appointed as a member of one of the Commissions of the Board. The typical pastor is of the opinion that he needs more fundamental knowledge of and experience with the

principles of religious education and general education to discharge fully the responsibilities of his teaching function to students.

He is not much disturbed by legal complaints raised about religious activities in the local campus community, but when and where such complaints are lifted loudly enough he would like to know how he can interpret the laws of the state regarding the legality of such religious activities. He wishes that he were better equipped to become a means of synthesizing points of view and a proper understanding of legal rights among administration, community, and personalities involved.

One is impressed as to how the typical pastor does not measure up to the standard set by the ideal college pastor in regard to the exercise of his teaching function as he relates to students. Obviously, that only one in five university parish ministers is equipped to teach some kind of a course in religion in connection with the college curriculum appears to be a small proportion. But data from this page of the questionnaire should not be used in judgment as to the overall willingness of college pastors to teach such courses or as to their ability to teach them with scholastic acceptability. In some states legal restrictions pertaining to the teaching of such courses are more strict than in others (or the interpretation or misinterpretation of them is more rigidly enforced). Other factors may prevent formal teaching. Thus, it may be reasonably concluded that many more pastors may be equipped for formal teaching than is indicated by their performance. Furthermore,

it is felt that a breakdown in figures from respective jurisdictions regarding this problem brings helpful perspective to the over-all point of view.

It is reasonable to presume that more pastors are not teaching courses in religion for credit in connection with college curricula because (1) local administrative officials may be unfriendly to and uncooperative with such a practice; or (2) the college pastor simply may not be well enough prepared with sufficient formal training and scholastic experience to be able to teach such a class, even if the school administration were disposed to welcome the teaching contributions of qualified pastors.

In the main it is observed that the engaging of local parish pastors for teaching religion on related college campuses is probably on the wane, and that as time passes the number of such pastors so engaged will diminish, rather than increase.

But there appears to be little excuse for the poor showing of pastors who teach non-credit courses for the participation of students. It would seem that more than the 30 per cent of the ministers who indicate that they are doing some formal instruction might be conducting classes in church membership, Bible study, missions, evangelism, teacher-training, and/or the teaching of the basic beliefs of the Christian faith. Any or all of these courses might become valuable learning situations for students if they were invited to participate in them. One wonders, "What are the 70 per cent of the pastors doing who are neglecting this phase of their ministry to students and to the university community?"

The fact that forty-five per cent of the pastors provide some sort of laboratory training experience in their parish churches for the training of churchmanship is commendable, but what about the remaining fifty-five per cent of the pastors who appear to be doing nothing in this area?

Also, greater use could be made of students as members of the Official Board and the various commissions and committees of the local church. Examples provided in this chapter by what some pastors are doing in this area are helpful illustrations of the benefit which might be derived both to church and to students by a more uniform practice of this procedure.

The value of more formal training and experience in religious education and general education is emphasized by the pastors themselves who feel a lack of sufficient preparation in these areas. Here perhaps is added reason for a college pastor's desire for reasonable status or security at a college post if he is willing to get the extra formal training which he feels he needs to exercise his teaching function acceptably in the university community.

It is significant that most violent objections to religious activity on the campuses of respective schools were found in the West, and as the observer moves away from the West the objections lessen in progression until the greatest tolerance in this matter is observed in the East. It is also significant that the basis for much complaint on legal grounds in the Northeast is raised by Jewish and Unitarian

voices, because of the concentration of these elements in that sector. And it is understandable to note that one of the complaints in the South is reported on the basis of interracial campus gatherings held in the name of religion.

Analysis of these data leads the observer to re-emphasize the need for an exacting study by the local parish pastor of the laws of his state regarding the status of religion and religious activities on the campus of his related school. This is highly important because of the evident variation of the concept of the law held by administrative officials. Frequently there is vague understanding of the law by university officials and public citizens of a university community who, desiring to interpret the law to their ends, deliberately misconstrue and misinterpret the original motive and intent of the constitutional provision which attempted to regulate matters of church and state on the campus of public institutions of higher education.

The Nebraska state college president who frowns upon the observance of Religious Emphasis Week on his campus because he "feels that there is something in the state constitution that makes it difficult to conduct such an observance at his school" illustrates the attitudes of some other college administrators. It is important that such laws be interpreted through the examination of facts, rather than by impulse or by feeling. Therefore, the university parish pastor will do a service to student life, as well as to the entire university community, if he will study the laws of his state in order that he

might help to interpret them in accordance with their original motive and intent. He will discover, and perhaps lead his community to discover, that frequently these laws are more liberal than commonly assumed.

In conclusion, it must be emphasized that even though there may not appear to be a large number of "incidents" reported from any single area, each one that is tabulated might well represent others that were not reported. And for every incident brought to light forcibly enough to raise a community issue there might have been a number of stifled resentments and personal objections that were not voiced loudly enough to attract attention. Although opposition in any one area totaled only six objections, the fact that there were seventeen complaints across the nation is cumulative enough to warrant attention. As volatile as this question is, a 7.58 per cent registration nationwise behooves university parish pastors to look into the laws and legal interpretations concerning religious activity on the campuses of their respective states in order that they might be able to recognize such complaints and help to synthesize administration and community misunderstandings concerning church and state if and when they are voiced.

The next chapter of this study will deal with an analysis of the fourth recognized function of the university parish pastor as he relates to students; namely, the function of Evangelism.

CHAPTER XIV

ANALYSIS OF QUESTIONNAIRE CONTINUED

THE FUNCTION OF EVANGELISM[1]

In order that a glow of warmth may be added to the otherwise cold statistics of this factual study, let us now examine data supplied by respondents in answer to questions concerning the fourth operative function of the university parish pastor as he relates to student life. This is the function of evangelism.

A. Analysis of the Data

Observations that are relative to the twelve questions found on page six of the instrument are divided into five general categories which will be treated in the following order: (1) methods of securing registration of Methodist-preference students, (2) student membership affiliation with the local parish church, (3) types of evangelism for the university community, (4) special emphases in campus evangelism, and (5) foreign students on the college campus. These areas of investigation will be reported seriatum.

1. Methods of Securing Student Registrations

This section of the inquiry was divided under two headings; namely, question 1 which dealt with the availability of religious-preference information secured by the university during registration week,

---

[1]See Appendix A, p. 526.

and question 2 which dealt with the use of the student secretary set-up of the Woman's Society of Christian Service for advance registration of Methodist students from their home churches. Data returned in answer to this block of questions is symbolized for review in Table 35.

TABLE 35

AVAILABILITY OF METHODIST-PREFERENCE REGISTRATIONS

Juris-	Are religious preference registrations available?		Information easily secured?		Use of WSCS student secretary?	
	"Yes" answers	Per cent	"Yes" answers	Per cent	"Yes" answers	Per cent
Western	32	91.5	33	94.2	25	71.5
North Central	58	98.2	55	93.0	42	71.2
North-eastern	33	91.6	30	83.5	24	66.7
South Central	45	100.0	45	100.0	33	73.4
South-eastern	49	100.0	49	100.0	39	79.6
Totals	217	97.0[a]	206	92.0[a]	163	72.5[a]

[a]Average of percentages in column above

a. Religious-preference registration: In answer to question 1, which concerns the availability of religious-preference registration of all students enrolling at the colleges or universities during the opening of fall and spring semesters, table 35 indicates that a high percentage of schools made this important information available. The practice seems to be 100 per cent perfected straight across the southern states and practically unanimous in the North Central area. Northeastern and the

West are observed deficient in this practice by 8.5 per cent. The West's poorer record here might be traced to the lower popularity of church and religious activity which traditionally obtains in that area. Also, stricter laws concerning church and state and/or a more rigid interpretation of such laws by school administrators in the West might account for the poorer showing here.

Western difficulty in regard to this matter is illustrated by one school which allows the passing out of religious-preference cards at registration time, but the administration will not participate in the registration. The cards are filed and become available to all religious student groups, but it is noted that many students do not fill out cards on this basis of voluntary registration. Another Western school issues religious-preference registration cards to incoming freshmen only at the beginning of each semester. A Washington state teachers' college which originally followed the practice of such registration has discontinued the custom due to a change in administrative policy.

At a North Central state school during registration week all student groups have tables for registration which is done by the respective groups. A Southeastern pastor reports that each new student fills out a chaplain's registration card, which is turned over to the local pastor entitled to receive the same. Duplicate cards are made for home town pastors of students who register religious preference, and these are mailed to respective cities.

Data do not reveal why the Northeast lags in these returns. Pastors in the West and Northeast might well be alerted by the relatively poorer returns of their jurisdictions to do what they can to facilitate

the making of such information available. On the whole, however, the ninety-seven per cent availability of this material across the nation is good.

It is one thing for university administrations to make this information available, but unless the data are easily obtained, i.e., without a struggle, it may be delayed getting into the hands of the local churches so long that intended value is dissipated. Therefore, question 1a was asked to ascertain whether this information was <u>easily</u> available. Returns of this sub-question, as viewed in the second column of Table 35, demonstrate close correlation with the ratio of availability of the information. Only about a five per cent difference, nationwide, separates the two. In other words, when and where ever information is available usually it appears to be available in suitable form and quickly enough to be of value.

North Central and the South appeared as cooperative here as indicated in returns from question 1. This information seems to be a little more difficult to secure in the Northeast than anywhere else in the nation. One wonders whether the traditionally high Roman Catholic population of the large cities of this area might be one reason for this poor showing. Data received here cannot document an assumption, but if this part of the study were pressed in a more thorough investigation, the questioning might produce interesting if not supportive findings.

A Western pastor notes that information is delayed about two weeks by the administration at his school. One North Central respondent states, "We finally get the information, but it is usually slow in coming"; and another from the same area comments, "The administration

doesn't have time to do it adequately." A Northeastern pastor reports, "The college allows us to get the information IF we can."

b. Use of Woman's Society Student Secretaries: A summary of data returned in answer to question 2, which proposed to measure the efficiency of the work of the local student secretaries of the Woman's Society of Christian Service who are asked by their respective churches to send advance registration of home town college students to the campus churches near to the schools of higher education where they will be enrolled, is observable in the right-hand column of Table 35.

This nationwide poll indicates that the system is nearly three-quarters effective. Southeastern leads in making such a system work with an affirmative ratio of four to one. South Central, North Central and Western rank in the low seventies, and Northeastern is lowest in this scoring. The poorer showing of the latter area appears to be correlative with the poor showing for the same area indicated in questions 1a and 1b.

On the whole, it appears that the student secretary "set-up" of the Woman's Society of Christian Service for securing advance notice of college registrations is good. In some places it breaks down, as personal comment reveals, and in other instances the fault for a poor showing rests with the college church which fails to make use of the names which are sent in time and in good faith by the local secretaries. This question produced ninety-seven responses in the form of personal comment which ranged from sharp criticism to favorable commendation.

The large number of comments received indicates that there is great interest in the possibilities of this system. Annotated observations received from jurisdictions in the following proportion: Western,

twenty-five or 25.8 per cent; North Central, twenty-eight or 28.8 per cent; Northeastern, ten or 10.3 per cent; South Central, twenty-three or 23.7 per cent; and Southeastern, eleven or 11.4 per cent. Most of the comments are complaints, and the larger number of complaints are correlative with the jurisdictions which have the most trouble making the system work.

For example, in the West which is responsible for one quarter of the complaints received across the nation, thirteen pastors stated that the system is a good one but that they get too few blue cards turned to them by the local secretaries of student work. Five pastors in the West indicated that when the cards do arrive they come too late to be of much use. Another weakness of the system which shows up in the West is that often information given on the blue card is incorrect. This retards the process of contact. One Westerner confided that he didn't know about the plan, and a general consensus of pastors in that area was that they would like to see the system carried out to a greater degree of perfection.

A majority of North Central pastors are agreed that the Woman's Society plan is a good one WHEN it is worked. The strength of the plan appears to be in that it provides information about the students beyond the mere registration of religious-preference which is given during the school registration, and at one school this information gets to pastors more quickly than information furnished by the administration. Nine pastors in this area reported that they receive the information too late to be effective. One North Central minister states, "Our Conference Woman's Society student secretary fails to communicate with the local societies regarding the duties of the local student secretaries, and here

the system breaks down." One pastor says, "These cards represent the interest of the student secretary MORE than they represent the interest of the student." And another from the same area wished that the blue card could give a local address of the student; otherwise he must wait until the student directory is published before individual students can be found.

Seven Northeastern pastors reported, "Too little and too late." One stated, "The system is too top-heavy in mechanics to be usable"; and another declared, "The plan doesn't work at all, because local student secretaries change every year and never really understand their jobs." A Pennsylvania pastor reported, "This year I received only four cards from local secretaries, even though we had a special appeal printed in our Conference Board of Education publication."

A half dozen South Central pastors wrote in high praise of the system, and another laments that too often some one who has little interest in students is selected for the job by local societies. Consequently, "Results are nil." One comment worth mentioning came from a pastor in this area who states, "This system is a hit-and-miss affair. The names we do get in advance are probably good prospects, but they would come to church anyway. IT IS THE NAMES OF THE OTHERS THAT WE NEED!"

Fewest comments came from the Southeastern Jurisdiction, where the plan appears to enjoy its greatest success. One stated, "We have been pleasantly surprised at the good work these women do." Another from this area said, "The plan is good, but there is not enough follow-up"; and still another remarked, "It is a good plan, but too much depends on the local secretary."

2. Student Membership Affiliation

In order to measure the effectiveness of the university parish pastor's evangelistic function as he relates to student life, the next block of two questions which were asked relative to student membership in the local parish church produced significant data which need to be analyzed with care. These questions were slanted at (1) establishing the degree of encouragement which is given by the pastor in enrolling students as members of the parish church, and (2) the form of membership which students are encouraged to choose. These data will be treated separately.

a. Encouraging church membership: Table 36 reviews data produced by question 3 which inquired as to how much pastors encourage students to seek some form of membership affiliation with the local church.

TABLE 36

HOW PASTORS ENCOURAGE STUDENT MEMBERSHIP

Jurisdiction	Considerable		Some		None	
	Number	Per cent	Number	Per cent	Number	Per cent
Western	7	20.0	26	74.3	2	5.7
North Central	15	25.4	23	39.0	21	35.5
North-eastern	3	8.3	19	52.8	14	38.8
South Central	6	13.3	31	69.0	8	17.8
South-eastern	14	28.5	29	59.1	6	12.2
Totals	45	20.2	128	57.1	51	22.7

According to Table 36, one in four pastors encourages students considerably to identify themselves with his local church as full or affiliate members; somewhat more than one-half offer some encouragement; and more than one in five offers no apparent encouragement at all to students to enlist as members.

The most encouragement is offered in the "considerable" category by pastors in the Southeast, which perhaps reflects the traditional emphasis on evangelistic preaching in that area. The next area persuading students towards membership in this category is North Central, which produced more pastors cooperating with this study than any other jurisdiction. Least encouragement in the "considerable" category is offered by Northeastern. Western ranks ahead of South Central in this category.

Western pastors lead the nation in the opinion that "some" encouragement of students towards church membership is preferable to "considerable," and Northeastern comes up with a conservative medium score in this category.

According to the final column in Table 36 Northeastern leads the country in pastors who do not press students to unite with the local parish church. Western scores at the opposite pole of the "none" category with only one in twenty pastors inferring that students should not be encouraged to enroll as members of the local parish church.

In weighing the above data, some consideration must be given to a few rather large Wesley Foundation groups on the campuses of state and independent schools which do not encourage enlistment of their members in a parish church. Instead they maintain their own autonomous organizations which they do not classify as regular stations affiliated with an Annual

Conference. At such situations the discouragement of students to "join" a local parish church might tend to throw figures in the above tables somewhat askew.

Question 3 elicited only fifteen personal comments: three from the West, six from North Central, two from the Northeast, three from South Central, and a single one from the Southeast. One Western pastor works for a decision if students are not members of a church, but otherwise he uses the affiliate relation little or none; and at another campus church in the West much stress is placed upon enlisting members from the married students, whereas single students are only encouraged somewhat to join. Five North Central respondents are unanimous in encouraging students to join locally if they are not already members, but they use little persuasion if students are members of the church in their home towns.

One Northeastern pastor states that when students join the church he has them affiliate with the home church, and another from the same area says that a campus plan of student activity makes it difficult for him to get students to affiliate with the parish church. A South Central pastor does not press for any kind of membership unless students are local residents; another tries to get married couples to join who do not plan to return to their home towns following graduation; and another tries to baptize many but favors the affiliate relationship. The single southeasterner who voiced written comment stated that he receives students only on an affiliate basis.

b. Form of membership offered to students: In answer to question 4, which inquired as to whether pastors encourage students to unite with the local parish church as full members or in the affiliate relationship, data were summarized in Table 37 which is presented herewith.

TABLE 37

HOW STUDENT MEMBERS ARE LISTED ON ROLL

Jurisdiction	Full membership		Affiliate membership		Both types membership		No membership	
	Number enrolling	Per cent	Number enrolling	Per cent	Number enrolling	Per cent	Number enrolling	Per cent
Western	9	25.7	9	25.7	17	48.5	1	2.9
North Central	6	10.2	25	42.4	15	25.4	13	22.1
North-eastern	8	22.2	15	41.6	6	16.7	7	19.5
South Central	2	4.6	21	46.5	17	37.7	5	11.1
South-eastern	5	10.1	30	61.3	14	28.5	0	00.0
Totals	30	13.4[a]	99	44.2[a]	69	30.8[a]	26	11.6[a]

[a]Average percentage of column above

According to Table 37, 88.4 per cent of the pastors in the nation believe that they should offer students an opportunity to enroll in their parish churches either as full members or in the affiliate relationship. A little over one in ten pastors do not encourage membership of any type.

Western leads in the percentage of pastors who encourage full membership with one-fourth of them designating that this is their preferred custom. Nearly as many Northeastern pastors offer full membership, and

Table 37 indicates that only about ten per cent of the ministers in North Central and Southeastern believe in this practice. South Central is decidedly in the minority here with less than one pastor in five supporting this practice.

Off-setting the low position of ministers who encourage full membership in the South Central and North Central areas, column two indicates that these jurisdictions rank second and third, respectively, in offering the affiliate relation to students. In contrast to the poorer showing made by Northeastern in other pastoral relationships explored by this study, this area ranks fairly high in offering both types of membership. And it is seen that whereas Southeastern ranked comparatively low in offering full membership to students, this area ranks supreme in encouraging affiliate membership. It is also observed that Western, which maintained a low-to-medium ranking in percentage figures in both "full" and "affiliate" columns, ranks number one among areas offering a combination of both types of memberships. Second place in this category goes to South Central, and Northeastern ranks lower in this regard than pastors in the Southern or North Central areas.

According to the "no membership" column in this table, in the North Central area approximately one pastor in five does not encourage the recording of students on his church roll in any type of designation. Northeastern ranks a close second in this regard. Western shows nearly a perfect record here, and in the Southeast every minister in the jurisdiction thought he should extend some kind of opportunity to students for enrolling in the local parish church.

The trend of the South towards a greater emphasis on evangelism than is manifest in any other area shows up clearly in this table. On the other hand, one needs to take into consideration that in other areas than the South there are some larger Wesley Foundations which operate autonomously as their own church bodies and do not officially offer either full or affiliate membership to their student constituents. These groups might be responsible for throwing figures in this table askew.

Also, in weighing these figures, the fact that some churches offer a combination of both types of membership must be considered. Obviously, jurisdictions that rank high in the "both" category could not rank so high in either the "full" or the "affiliate" categories.

Most of the written comments elicited by this question were from the North Central area. Three differing views of pastors in this area are illustrated by their replies. "Full membership is not too valuable either for students or for the church. We place moderate stress on affiliate membership." "We encourage Christian commitment and membership, but not particularly to OUR church." "We encourage full membership for resident students and affiliate membership for the non-residents."

The Northeastern Jurisdiction makes the poorest showing of all the areas in the number of students enrolled as church members in the parish church. The "evangelistic score" of eighteen Northeastern pastors in terms of the number of students who are enrolled as members in their parish churches is indicative of the poor record of this area.

In fairness to the Northeast, however, it should be pointed out that these are Methodist pastors reporting, and that they do not illustrate the true picture of student work throughout all of New England

Protestantism. Because of the cooperative nature of much student work in the Northeast and because Methodist student work is not heavily concentrated in that area, returns of all types from this section were limited and somewhat askew. Also, the eighteen churches that were selected by the writer for tabulation in the next table (Table 38) were the eighteen churches that showed the poorest records of the thirty-six returns from that area.

Table 38 visualizes the membership records of eighteen Northeastern pastors who reported ten or fewer than ten students who are enrolled as members of the local college-related Methodist Church.

It is observed that seven of these eighteen pastors who represent 27 per cent of the pastors surveyed in the Northeastern jurisdiction, do not record a single student member either in full or affiliate relationship. Yet these seven pastors report a total of 893 Methodist-preference students on their respective campuses, and they state that they relate vitally and/or casually to a total of 375 of these students. But they do not enlist a single student on the rolls of their churches in any type of membership. Also, these pastors who represent one-half of the students of the Northeastern jurisdiction have 3,653 Methodist-preference students on their campuses; and they relate vitally or casually to a total of 1,775 students for an average of 49 per church. Yet they average only two and one-half students listed as members of their respective churches.

In chapter IX we discovered that the typical pastor relates to 241 students both vitally and casually, and that he enrolls an average of 50 students in the membership of his parish church.[1] Thus we see that

---

[1] Above, p. 204.

TABLE 38

EVANGELISM SCORE OF 18 NORTHEASTERN PASTORS
AS THEY RELATE TO STUDENTS

Designation of pastor	Number Methodist-preference students on campus	Number of students to whom pastor relates	Number of students enrolled in local parish church
No. 1	85	53	0
No. 2	50	10	0
No. 3	229	20	0
No. 4	90	60	0
No. 5	89	75	0
No. 6	200	85	0
No. 7	150	75	0
No. 8	80	50	1
No. 9	90	40	2
No. 10	150	75	2
No. 11	400	300	3
No. 12	100	35	3
No. 13	170	170	4
No. 14	500	32	4
No. 15	250	125	4
No. 16	300	100	4
No. 17	425	225	10
No. 18	320	240	10
Totals	3,653	1,775	46

the Northeastern pastors are relating to only one-fifth the number of students to whom the typical pastor relates, and they enroll only five per cent of the student members enlisted by the composite pastor. It would appear as though pastors of this area are doing poorly in this area of ministry to students.

There appears to be correlation between this poor showing of Northeastern pastors and the limited amount of student visitation-enlistment that was reported from this area.

3. Types of Evangelism for Students[1]

This category was divided into two questions: (1) dealing with the types of Evangelism as suited to students in rated order of importance, and (2) inquiry as to the most suitable time-emphasis for the practice of campus evangelism. An analysis of data returned from these queries is now before us. It will be examined seriatum.

---

[1]In the cursory treatment accorded to evangelism in this study, the writer points out that this treatment might appear to be based on a traditional identification of evangelism with the enlistment of church members. A deeper and more fundamental definition of the term "evangelism" as the act of God that takes place when one person communicates the basic elements of the Christian faith to another is implied. The reader is reminded that strict limitations had to be established in designing the instrument in order that certain areas of behavior could be selected for measurement. Evangelism is such a nebulous entity that measurement of its myriad and profound implications in its complete definition through the use of a questionnaire directed at geographical areas of diverging consensus is difficult. Membership enlistment has been selected merely as <u>one mode</u> of evangelism which can be observed in behavior and which might be used as an instrument for measuring an observable phase of the phenomenon.

Whether it is right or wrong, The Methodist Church has customarily associated "evangelism" with "membership." For example, the Commission on Membership and Evangelism is one of the most important divisions of the local church organization. Even the designation "membership" is listed first--as if it ranked ahead of evangelism.

a. Types of evangelism: In answer to question 5 which invited pastors to rate five commonly known types of evangelism as suited to college students, returned data were condensed in Table 39, which is presented herewith.

TABLE 39

RELATIVE IMPORTANCE OF EVANGELISM METHODS

Evangelistic method	Rated order of importance					
	1	2	3	4	5	No answer
Mass evangelism (revivalism)	5	9	10	11	58	20
Lay-visitation evangelism (membership enlistment)	44	54	34	14	3	20
Personal, continuous, all-out witnessing	126	43	13	10	2	20
University Christian Mission	19	47	53	26	3	20
"Win-my-chum" tactics	8	32	29	32	10	20

In scoring data the reader will note that a total of twenty pastors made no answer to this question, which may or may not denote that they had little interest in this aspect of campus evangelism. The "no answers" were fairly evenly scattered through all jurisdictions with the exception of the West, which had only one pastor who failed to check this question. The remaining "no answers" were divided as follows: North Central 5, Northeast 4, South Central 5, and Southeast 5.

Using the same method for scoring as was employed with question 7 on page four of the questionnaire (evaluating each first choice at 5 points, second choice at 4 points, etc.), first choice in relative

importance of methods of campus evangelism was personal, continuous, all-out witnessing in campus life with a total of 797 points. Second choice was the University Christian Mission method with 660 points;[1] third place was accorded to lay-visitation evangelism (visitation enlistment) with 633 points; fourth place was awarded to "win-my-chum" tactics; and mass evangelism or revivalism rated last place with 336 points.

The same caution must be used in evaluating these figures as was urged regarding question 7 on page four; namely, that classification of methods is somewhat vague so that resultant figures may not be too exact. Two definite conclusions may be assumed from this calculation, however, i.e., (1) that personal, all-out, continuous witnessing is the most popular and the most effective single method of campus evangelism in use; and (2) that mass evangelism or revivalism is by far the least effective and least popular method used in contemporary campus evangelism.

And when figures for the first three choices (rather than all five choices) are studied, visitation enlistment gets the call over the University Christian Mission method by a substantial margin.[2] In every jurisdiction personal, continuous evangelism rated first choice by a heavy majority, and the second choice of all jurisdictions appears to be

---

[1]It should be pointed out here that as the University Christian Mission was practiced it assumed a form of visitation enlistment of students which was a form of lay-visitation evangelism. Therefore it might present a more realistic picture if the figures for participation of both of these phases of campus evangelism were added together. This would make a total of 1,323 points for this combined method, which is nearly twice the number of points amassed by the "all-out" witnessing category. When considered in this way the importance of the "visitation enlistment" phase of campus evangelism as treated in this study assumes more significant proportions.

[2]Ibid.

lay-visitation. Mass evangelism rated fifth choice in all areas. However, there were three pastors in the West who rated mass evangelism number one, and not a single pastor in the Southeast considered this type of evangelism worthy of first choice. The highest percentage of pastors in any one area choosing personal, continuous, all-out witnessing was found in the Southeastern Jurisdiction, where it has already been established that campus evangelism is probably more effectively in vogue than anywhere else in the nation.

That there is a sense of urgency on the part of pastors as they search for better tools with which to fulfill their evangelistic obligation to student life is reflected in the following statements which they volunteered. A North Central man says, "Our youth groups tend to be just another fraternity or sorority for those not in such a fellowship. Personal, all-out witnessing is our greatest need." A Southeastern pastor remarks, "Students are greatly influenced by the witnessing of other students, but such a student personality should be genuinely Christian and a whole personality--not the fanatic type." A Westerner confesses, "We are weak in this area. In a vague way we invite people to 'Come to Christ,' but as to persuading youth to be Christian instead of secular--we have no program and no success." Creative criticism is offered by an Ohio Pastor whose entire quotation merits study:

> I think that the most effective evangelism of students can be done through well trained, intelligent professors who are thoroughly committed to the Christian philosophy of life, and who can in a sound way relate this philosophy and ethic to their individual field of knowledge. Also I feel that the individual is a powerful force for evangelism in the life of the campus community. Perhaps if more pastors had opportunity for close association with students in classroom activities, more could be accomplished in this line.

Representative of the general estimation of the value of mass evangelism when practiced as revivalism was the statement of the North Central brother who says, "I take a dim view of many prevalent mass efforts and pressure techniques of campus evangelism." One of the less optimistic pastors in this area, who is decidedly in a minority, is convinced that campus evangelism is a lost cause as he says, "There is NO type of evangelism which is of importance to students, and I do not profess to practice any at all." A North Central pastor who feels hampered by state legal restrictions on the campus of a public institution concludes this section of representative comment with, "At a state university there are limits to which you can go in the way of Evangelism."

b. When to practice evangelism: In answer to question 6, which asked pastors to evaluate special times or seasons when they prefer to stress evangelism among students, fourteen were in favor of practicing the function especially at certain seasons of the year, eighty-nine were in favor of an all-year continuous program of evangelism, 102 thought that a combination of these two methods produced the best results, and nineteen failed to answer the question. Thus about one-half the pastors were divided by a ratio of six to one in favor of stressing continuous evangelism rather than accenting the function at special seasons. The other one-half of the respondents agreed that a combination of continuous witnessing plus stress at certain seasons was the most effective method. This same standard as established throughout the nation appeared to prevail uniformly within the separate jurisdictions.

The nineteen pastors who failed to answer this question were distributed as follows: Western 1, North Central 6, Northeastern 4, South Central 7, and Southeastern 1. The heaviest percentage of the "no answers" was in the South Central and the Northeast, and the most favorable returns came from the West and Southeast.

4. Special Emphases in Campus Evangelism

Material grouped under this heading was returned in answer to questions 7 through 11 on page six of the instrument. These data will be examined in the following order: (1) observance of Religious Emphasis Week, (2) lay-visitation evangelism by student groups, (3) the place of revivalism in campus evangelism, (4) the need for a moral equivalent for former methods of campus evangelism, and (5) inquiry as to whether the final work in campus evangelism has been spoken.

a. Religious Emphasis Week: In answer to question 7, which inquired as to whether related schools covered in the survey offered a Religious Emphasis Week or some similar religious activity for the participation of students, Table 40 shows that a total of 167 schools or about three-fourths of the institutions reported in the affirmative. Major emphasis on this activity promoting campus evangelism is in the South, with Southeastern registering nearly 90 per cent and South Central close behind. The fewest number of schools offering such a program is found in the Northeast where only about half the institutions involved offer such a plan. In the West it was noted that three schools out of every five offer some sort of periodic religious emphasis program.

TABLE 40

SCHOOLS OFFERING RELIGIOUS EMPHASIS WEEK

Jurisdiction	"Yes" answers	Per cent
Western	21	60.0
North Central	44	74.5
Northeastern	19	52.7
South Central	39	86.5
Southeastern	44	89.5
Totals	167	74.5[a]

[a]Average percentage of column above

Some "write-in" comments were received in answer to this question to the effect that in certain areas where Religious Emphasis Week has been in vogue for several years it appears to lose its flavor and limps along or plays out altogether.

Most of the written comments about Religious Emphasis Week appeared to be negative in character, but they were few in number and cannot be construed as representative of the general trend of this activity throughout the nation. Two Western pastors reported the discontinuance of efforts to schedule such a week due to lack of interest, but one of these suggested that he needs a substitute or counterpart for the same idea at his school. The other Western pastor said that an unofficial Religious Emphasis Week was attempted but not repeated.

A South Central pastor reported, "We had a Religious Emphasis week on our state-related campus last year with good results. This year

we will have two special emphases, in the fall and in the spring." A North Central respondent indicated the observance of such a week on the campus of his school but intimates, "the program has been so adulterated to include Jews, Catholics, etc., that it is no longer of much value as an evangelistic agency."

He was of the opinion that a Christian Mission for the Campus would be more effective as sponsored by a Council of Churches. "Much more thought and planning must be done here," he concluded. A South Central pastor said,

> I fear that the old Religious Emphasis week is outmoded and frankly ineffective, unless everyone is involved and it truly becomes an all-campus affair, including fraternities, sororities, etc. Like revivals, the effect soon dies--and therefore I think in the long run a continuous person-to-person emphasis is needed. But that falls on the shoulders of a very few who have something to witness! Hence the dilemma. Yes, WE DO NEED NEW APPROACHES IN THIS AREA OF OUR MISSION TO STUDENTS.

b. Lay-visitation evangelism: When asked in question 8 about the amount of systematic lay-visitation evangelism practiced by their students, pastors reported that about one in ten groups practiced this form of campus evangelism considerably; more than one-half of them participated to some degree; and nearly one-third of them did not use this method at all. These data are summarized for the nation in Table 41. The largest number of pastors reporting "considerable" use of this method reside in the Southeast, whereas the West scores the poorest record in reporting this category. The Southeast also leads in the number of schools where "some" lay-visitation evangelism is practiced by students. Second place in the "some" category is held by South Central, and third place in this aspect of evangelism is claimed by the West.

TABLE 41

VISITATION EVANGELISM AND "REVIVALISM"

Questions[a]	Per cent considerable	Per cent some	Per cent none
8. How much lay-visitation does your student group do?	9.9	61.5	28.5
9. How much place for "Revivalism" is there in campus evangelism?	2.7	33.0	64.3

[a]Numbers refer to questions on questionnaire. See Appendix A, p. 526.

A total of sixty-four pastors reported no use at all of the lay-visitation method. The highest percentage of these pastors is from the Northeast, but this record is somewhat off-set by the fact that Northeast enjoys second ranking when pastors whose student groups do considerable lay-visiting are tabulated.

Because 70 per cent of the students of a San Francisco university live outside the city limits and commute, any program of visitation evangelism tried there is apparently useless. A South Central pastor relates, "Lay visitation by students on our campus is resisted by the MSM director." The following comment by a Western pastor who conducts lay-visitation among students with some success merits quoting in detail:

> Personal calling on students is a worthy goal. Next year we hope to call on every student. To date calling has been limited to some dormitory visitation, hospital calling, and visiting among the married students. THE MARRIED STUDENTS ARE CALLED ON BY THE CHURCH COMMISSION ON EVANGELISM AND IN EVERY WAY RECEIVE THE SAME TREATMENT AS THE REGULAR CHURCH CONSTITUENCY LIST.

> Our plan of visitation is for students to call on students. Group calling is done in the girls' dorm parlors. A group of Wesleyites, together with one of the church staff, make engagements to meet and talk with selected students in one of the parlors.

c. The place of "revivalism" in campus evangelism: When asked in question 9 concerning opinions about how much place there is for "revivalism" in campus evangelism today, as summarized in Table 36, less than three per cent of the respondents thought that this practice should figure heavily in contemporary student life. One third of the pastors thought that it had "some" place in campus life, and nearly two-thirds deemed that it had no place at all on the modern American college scene.

There were only six pastors in the nation who thought that considerable emphasis ought to be placed on this form of campus evangelism, and five of these six reside in the Southeast. The remaining single pastor in this group resides in the Northeast. The heaviest concentration of those who figured that revivalistic methods had no place in today's campus life was in North Central and the West. Sixty-four per cent of the pastors canvassed think that this form of evangelism has no place at all in the way they discharge their evangelistic obligations to student life.

It should be noted here that some pastors reacted negatively to the way this question was stated. They stated that it was "poor," "loaded," "didn't understand," etc. A few reactions like this might have been expected among so many returns to a somewhat controversial question. A South Central pastor says that there is some place for mass meetings of students with GOOD preaching. A Northeasterner states that

he believes there is some place for mass meeting evangelism and concludes, "Intervarsity has penetrated our campus at last." Another South Central respondent replies, "Many students would respond avidly to a revivalistic approach; but I doubt its emotional or moral good."

d. Need for "moral equivalent" of former methods: The first column of Table 42 visualizes a summary of replies to question 10 which asked pastors whether they thought there is need for a moral equivalent for yester-year's revivalistic and soul-winning techniques of student-witnessing for Christ on the campus. Nearly three-fourths of the pastors canvassed answered this question positively, with South Central leading the jurisdictions percentagewise. Successive rankings by areas in order of percentage were scored by South Central, Southeastern, North Central, Northeastern, and Western. A Southeastern pastor comments regarding this matter, "The solution to a need for our 'moral equivalent' is simply to keep our evangelistic work fresh and vital."

TABLE 42

OPINIONS ABOUT EVANGELISTIC EMPHASIS

	Is there need for moral equivalent of former methods?		Has the final word in campus evangelism been spoken?	
Jurisdiction	"Yes" answers	Per cent	"No" answers	Per cent
Western	25	71.2	34	97.1
North Central	40	68.0	58	98.0
Northeastern	26	72.3	35	97.0
South Central	33	84.5	45	100.0
Southeastern	38	77.5	48	98.0
Totals	162	72.3[a]	220	98.4[a]

[a]Percentage of column above

e. The final word in campus evangelism: In response to question 11, which asked pastors whether they thought that the final word had been spoken regarding the method of student witnessing or evangelism on the campus, the right hand column in Table 41 illustrates that practically all of the ministers in this study agree that there is still considerable exploration yet to be made in this area of student relations and that the final answer is not yet in. Jurisdictions are so nearly in 100 per cent agreement on this matter that there is little value gained in noting that South Central heads the list of areas with every single pastor voting positively, because all other areas rank closely behind within a span of only three per cent variation. This tabulation reports answers so nearly in agreement across the nation that perhaps this question need not have been included. Nevertheless, discovering that such a large majority are unanimously in accord in their thinking in this area is valuable to the total thrust of the study.

In commenting on this question between the lines a Western pastor observed that we should always be on the look-out for new methods of student witnessing, but it appears to date that personal contact is our strongest witness to the power of Christ in one's life. Another Western pastor makes this suggestion:

> The fact that a Methodist minister can easily become related to a college parish without thorough evolution of his training and without some specific approach on evangelism or anything else LEARNED before he goes to work, and with no specific method of evangelism recommended as "our way"-- indicates that more synthesis and conviction of "best method" need to be decided upon, promoted, and taught.

North Central pastors are agreed that "we must have a fresh and effective method of campus evangelism." From the same area comes this searching comment:

> We must have a more imaginative approach. The greatest challenge and need is for a new and more effective slant on student evangelism. It is difficult for a church sitting on the sidelines of a great university to do what ought to be done in reaching the mass of students.

Another North Central pastor reflects, "The findings of this study should be able to bring out something valuable here." A Southeastern respondent who represents the feeling of a number of pastors in his area suggests:

> We may find better methods some day, but of those tried so far it seems to me that the evangelistic appeal of mass preaching is still highly effective. Perhaps it is wise to see that many commitments are made in mass assemblies and conferences. It is not enough to reach only the "mind." The emotion must also be reached. Either without the other is inadequate.

A South Central pastor is convinced that students tend to be afraid of evangelistic methods as practiced by the local church and that they need more personal training in them. A Northeasterner who is of the same opinion says,

> Students need more training in the basic tenets of the Church. This would help them in approaching others. I think that it is hard to beat direct contact of students with students in bearing witness.

A Western Jurisdiction respondent feels, "There is need for a closer cooperation between the faculty, the church and the student center. (One is waiting for the other to be the evangelist.)" Perhaps the consensus of a majority of the pastors regarding this matter is summed up in the reply of two respondents who declare, "The final word has not yet been spoken in regard to campus evangelism--it never will be."

5. Foreign Students on the College Campus

Question 12 was broken down into four sub-questions; namely, (1) How many foreign students on your campus? (2) From how many countries do they come? (3) Does your local church have youth activities beside Sunday services which include foreign students? (4) If so, describe. Data returned were assembled as follows:

a. Number of foreign students: There were twenty-eight pastors who ignored this question, and hence it may be presumed that they have few or no foreign students on the campuses of their related schools. To this number may be added a total of twenty-one pastors who reported they had no foreign students, and hence they could not answer this question. This leaves 175 pastors who report a total of 12,804 students, or an average of seventy-three foreign students for every pastor who indicated their presence in his community. Reported by jurisdictions these students are geographically grouped as follows: Western 4,346, North Central 5,307, Northeastern 532, South Central 1,442, Southeastern 1,177. Nationwide the average local church finds fifty-seven foreign students on its related campus.

It is observed that both Western and North Central are by far the popular choice of these students for residence in the United States. Both of these areas contain more foreign students than the Northeastern, South Central and Southeastern areas combined. Northeastern, with fewest foreign students reported also has the largest number of pastors reporting no foreign students, which is thirteen. Two discrepancies in these figures which give a false impression of the over-all picture

should be noted here. First, because of the cooperative nature of much student work in the Northeast this is one of Methodism's weakest areas in the reporting of student work. Consequently, reports of Methodist pastors in that area would not reveal many foreign students connected with Methodist work in that jurisdiction. Secondly, it is a known fact that there are heavy concentrations of foreign students in centers like Boston, New York, New Haven, and Philadelphia which do not show up in these figures because Methodist pastors of university churches in those areas do not show such a gathering of foreign students there. The figures simply do not come through in these data. From the returns of these data the largest concentration of foreign students (for observation in this study) is registered at the University of California with 1,300 foreign students. The second largest body of "international guests" is at Michigan State University, with an enrollment of 1,000 foreign students registered there.

b. Number of countries involved: It was the intent of question 12 to discover, if possible, from how many different countries these foreign students come. But the question was not framed with sufficient skill to elicit precise information. There was no way for pastors to indicate which specific countries their foreign students came from. Therefore, when they reported 12,804 foreign students from a grand total of 1,614 countries, the figures included innumerable repetitions. This is misleading. These figures show that foreign students come to the American campus from many lands, but they do not identify the exact number of countries of their origin. A reasonable idea of the approximate

number of countries sending foreign students to American universities may be gained from the report of the pastor at Berkeley, California, the scene of the largest foreign student delegation in the nation. He estimates that ninety countries are represented in the student body of the University of California.

c. Programs for participation of foreign students: When canvassed in question 12b as to whether local parish churches offered programs for participation of foreign students besides the regular Sunday services, fifty-nine pastors indicated that their churches offered such programs, and 165 pastors stated that their churches did not. The proportion of churches not offering such programs runs about three to one throughout the respective areas, with the exception of the North Central area where the rate is about two to one. The lowest total number of churches offering such a program was in the Northeast with seven, and the largest number is in the North Central area which polled twenty-one. Western recorded nine in this category, South Central ten, and Southeastern twelve.

d. Description of programs: More than fifty pastors responded to question 12c which invited them to describe their programs of activities which include foreign students aside from regular Sunday services to which they would normally be invited anyway.

While the original motive behind question 12c was to discover what our local churches were doing for foreign students, more than fifty per cent of the pastors who described programs told about plans in which the foreign students were used as special speakers or participants in programs chiefly designed for the benefit of the American congregations who

employed them for the occasion. Thus it is significant that the primary motive of most local churches in relating to foreign students is to exploit them, rather than to do something for them. On the other hand, nearly a dozen pastors told about inviting them to private homes for dinner as a regular practice through the year; ten stated they honor them annually by inviting them to international banquets at which they are guests of honor without having to perform; a Northeastern pastor received an African student into full membership; a number have fair success integrating foreign students into the regular activities of the local church, including youth groups; and one Woman's Society pays the annual dinner cost of several foreign students to a Methodist Student Movement international dinner.

Ways in which foreign students are invited to "perform" were as speakers for Schools of Missions and missionary emphases by both local churches and Woman's Societies. A Southeastern pastor effectively uses foreign students on deputation teams, which, no doubt, presents a powerful argument for integration. A glance at some of the programs for foreign students in the various jurisdictions reveals what is being done about this important phase of "evangelism" on the campus.

A Western pastor reports a special welcoming committee that makes a point of looking up foreign students and inviting them to church and private homes for dinner. Holiday season is a time of special emphasis for relating to this group. One Western pastor reported that there is a dearth of signatures of foreign students on religious preference cards at his school. This might or might not be explainable, but such explanation is not made in the data received.

A North Central pastor told about scheduling special hours for counseling with foreign students. Another pastor from the same area made a point of having families invite foreign students to be their honored table guests at Family Night church dinners. Another pastor from this jurisdiction noted reluctance on the part of his people to include foreign students in the local church program because most of them are not avowed Christians. A Wesley Foundation housed in a local church invited foreign students to participate in its program regularly, "as individuals and not as oddities." A pastor related to Ohio State University said that his church sponsors a group of twenty-four educators from nineteen countries, hosting them at special services and frequently entertaining them in homes. Another church in this area extends an invitation for a Chinese student group to meet regularly within their quarters, which provides opportunity for learning race relations.

A Nebraska pastor described a memorial fund which provides $1,800 per year for foreign student scholarships. On a South Central campus it is the desire of the director of the Methodist Student Movement that relationships with foreign students remain under his control at the student center. In the Southeast a pastor complained that some foreign students are "too busy" to take part in special programs. According to another Southeastern minister, most of the foreign students on his related campus are Roman Catholics.

More than 50 per cent of the descriptions of these programs came from pastors in the North Central area; eight came from the West; and only two each came from the Northeast, Southeast, and South Central areas. This proportion might be traced to two reasons: (1) more foreign students

attend Western and North Central schools (as reported by pastors in this study), and (2) it is highly possible that due to recognized geographical and sociological color barriers in the South there is not as much experimentation with foreign student relationships in this area. At one South Central church foreign students are used as Race Relations Day speakers. This might lead one towards one or both of two possible conclusions; i.e., (1) that foreign students are deliberately "used" to enhance the observance of Race Relations Day; and, or (2) that they are used in the place of Negro students on programs because of a higher tolerance of students from foreign countries. The data do not justify either of these conclusions, but they do suggest that these churches are doing little in the way of practicing real race relations.

B. Summary

In this chapter important findings have added an aura of warmth to the picture of our typical university parish pastor regarding the fulfillment of his evangelistic function within the university community. He is able, without much exception or serious difficulty, to secure religious preference registrations through the cooperation of the school administration. He finds the student-secretary arrangement for the advance registration of new students by the Woman's Society of Christian Service about 70 per cent effective and wishes that this valuable aid to his ministry could be perfected. He offers "some" rather than "considerable" encouragement to students to enroll as members in the local parish church. Chances are about one to five that he does not encourage either full membership or the affiliate relation to students on his related campus.

The typical pastor believes that personal, continuous witnessing by students in everyday campus life is their most effective form of evangelism, and that there is little or no place for revivalism on the contemporary campus. He has mixed feelings about the use of visitation evangelism or visitation enlistment as performed by the students themselves. He would like to see this method succeed, but has only moderate to little success in teaching students to use it acceptably. He is in favor of stressing campus evangelism with a moderate and steady emphasis, with some seasonal accent, through the school year rather than going all out spasmodically to fulfill his responsibility to student life in this area of his ministry.

There is a three to one probability that he takes part in a Religious Emphasis Week or some similar religious observance on the campus of his related school. He is certain that all the answers are not in concerning campus evangelism and that a "moral equivalent" for yesteryear's soul-winning witnessing for Christ among students is overdue. He is aware of the fifty-seven foreign students on his related campus, but is vague as to how to relate to them without exploiting them. More often than not he is more willing to "use" the foreign student than he is to serve him, and too rarely is there an indication that an honorarium has been received for performance. The typical pastor has only begun to realize the potential opportunity for modern evangelism which prevails in his relating to future world leaders who journey from many lands to American universities in search of economic, social, agricultural, engineering, and inspirational equipment with which to solve critical enigmas in their own countries.

Data relative to four of the five functions of the university parish pastor as he relates to student life having been analyzed, the writer will now turn to an observance of material concerning the fifth and final function of this pastor; namely, the administrative function.

CHAPTER XV

ANALYSIS OF QUESTIONNAIRE CONTINUED

THE FUNCTION OF ADMINISTRATION[1]

The portrait of our typical university parish pastor nears completion in harmony and balance. In preceding chapters we have noted how the canvass for the composition of our study was furnished by institutional data, and how the brushes and pigments were supplied by observation of material concerning plant, program, and important pastoral relationships. We have also observed how an analysis of the preaching function brings our portrait into sharper focus, how a review of the counseling function contributes an atmosphere of depth, how a factual consideration of the teaching function provides perspective, and how careful weighing of returns concerning the evangelistic function adds an aura of warmth. But unless the results of the final sitting are suitably framed, our finished portrait will not be acceptably displayed so that it expresses true dimension and correct spatial relationship; nor will it be set off with fitting decor to the advantage that it merits.

Our picture needs a proper frame to complete the harmony of the composition and to hold together its component parts. Without a suitable frame it will lack external structure and hang askew on the gallery-wall of the university community. Such a frame is supplied by an analysis of the administrative function of the university parish pastor as he ministers

---

[1]See Appendix A, p. 527.

to student life. The objective of this chapter will be to examine data returned from respondents concerning this final function.

A. Analysis of the Data

Answers to the thirteen questions asked on page seven of the questionnaire will be measured and observed according to data returned in seven blocks or categories; namely, questions concerning (1) the Campus-Church Relations Committee, (2) relation to other student movements and conference organizations, (3) the financing of student work, (4) the responsibility for public relations, (5) relationships with the university faculty, (6) relationships to united, inter-faith and other groups, and (7) matters of appointment and status.

1. The Campus-Church Relations Committee

Data returned from this first block of questions relative to the administrative function will be divided into three sections: (1) inquiry as to the number of Campus-Church Relations Committees at university parish churches, (2) a description of these student-church relations committees, and (3) a review of how some of these committees are functioning. A summary of these data are condensed in Table 43.

a. Number of Campus-Church Relations Committees: In answer to question one, which asked about the Campus-Church Relations Committee as defined in paragraph 1365 of the 1960 Discipline of The Methodist Church,[1] column one of Table 43 reveals that more than one-third of the pastors involved in this nationwide survey, or ninety in all, designated that they

---

[1]Discipline for 1960, p. 379.

TABLE 43

HOW LOCAL PARISH METHODIST CHURCHES RELATE TO STUDENTS THROUGH COMMITTEES

Jurisdiction	Do you have a Campus-Church committee? "Yes" answers	Per cent	Do you have some other committee? "Yes" answers	Per cent	Churches without committee Number	Per cent
Western	12	34.2	8	22.8	15	43.0
North Central	20	34.0	13	22.1	26	44.0
Northeastern	16	44.6	9	25.0	11	30.5
South Central	15	33.3	20	44.4	10	22.2
Southeastern	27	55.0	13	26.5	9	15.3
Totals	90	40.2[a]	63	28.0[a]	71	31.7[a]

[a]Average of percentages

maintained such a committee through which they and their churches relate to student life. Southeastern Jurisdiction leads the nation in this regard. Northeastern, with nearly half of her churches reporting "Yes," is in second place. Western, North Central and South Central follow--all within range of a single per cent. Some of the churches reporting the existence of this committee admitted that its chief duty is caring for the financial needs of the group.

In justice to the record established by this table, however, it is only fair to remind the observer that in many churches some similar kind of a committee serves as a liaison between campus and church, such

as the Board of Directors of a Wesley Foundation. Since the beginning of this study and the return of these data a new committee known as the Committee on Campus Religious Life has been added to the authorized types of governing bodies for student work in Methodist-related colleges and universities.[1]

b. Other forms of church committees relating to student life: Because a number of university parish churches have other committees than the disciplinary Campus-Church Relations Committee by which they relate to student life, question 1a was asked to determine the nature of these other committees. A total of 28 per cent of the churches involved in this survey are found in this category, as summarized in the second column of Table 43. South Central had the most of these committees with "other" designations, and North Central had the least number. Western was a fraction of one per cent ahead of North Central Jurisdiction.

The third column of Table 43, which indicates the number of churches that do not have any kind of committee through which to relate to student life in their respective college communities, is valuable to this study because it pinpoints the areas where the least is being done about this matter. The highest percentage of churches having no committee was found in North Central, while Western had very few. Southeastern, at the other extreme of data offered here, showed the best record of all areas in this regard. This area also reported the best record in column one of the same

---

[1]There will be no consideration of the Committee on Campus Religious Life in connection with the analysis of these data. This committee was not created until the 1960 session of the General Conference and hence was not in existence at the time of the distribution of the questionnaire.

table. It is significant that nearly one-third of the churches involved in this study did not claim any kind of a church-student relations committee.

c. A description of some of the "other" committees: Twenty-six pastors revealed that in place of the Campus-Church Relations Committee they operate with a Wesley Foundation Board of Directors. Some pastors are related to both a Wesley Foundation Board of Directors and a Campus-Relations Committee. At three churches a local board of directors performs the function of the committee, and at three other churches the function of this committee is cared for by the Commission on Education of the Official Board. Two pastors report a committee composed of Methodist professors and interested alumni, and at two additional churches there is a Student-Christian Coordinating Committee. Other arrangements reported by single pastors included the following: Interconference Committee on Student Work, Annual Conference Committee for solicitation of financial support, a Woman's Society of Christian Service student work committee, a joint committee sponsored by three local Methodist churches, and a city council of churches.

Pastors who described the operation of Wesley Foundation Boards of Directors revealed that most of these committees are functioning about as they should according to the definition of such a Board of Directors in paragraph 1365 of the Methodist Discipline.[1] A Western pastor described his Board of Directors and how it operates as representative of this group as follows:

---

[1] Ibid., p. 380.

> We have a Wesley Foundation Board of Directors, all members of the local church. It is composed of trustees of the local church, president of the student group, pastors of the local church, District Superintendents of the adjacent District, the Bishop, and some representation at large. The Board also meets to evaluate plant and program in all phases and carry on the business management. It administers budget, hires staff, meets plant needs, etc. The Board meets annually as a corporation to survey program and operation as a whole.

In the South Central Jurisdiction one campus-related church which sponsors a Wesley Foundation welcomes representatives of other churches of the city on its board. This group helps to relate the program of student work to surrounding churches, as well as to the sponsoring church. In a Northeastern city there is a United Protestant Association, made up of seven members at large, four parents, seven faculty and staff member, and six students. Denominations supporting this association are Methodist, Baptist, Presbyterian, Lutheran, and Unitarian. Another Northeastern pastor reported a joint committee from the three local Methodist churches which sponsors a unified Methodist Student Fellowship. It meets in the church building located adjacent to the campus.

Some pastors who have tried to organize a governing board for student work have failed in the attempt and quit trying. A North Central pastor stated, "Our school is historically non-Methodist; therefore we do not feel that we should undertake this relationship at present." A Southeastern pastor who has no committee said that this work is accomplished by a local student who is employed by the church to affect such relations, and a Northeastern pastor who has no committee confessed, "Here the student work is all on the shoulders of the pastor, with the exception of some help given by Methodist faculty members."

Several pastors who boast no official committee wrote that theirs is not a "normal college situation." They told why such a committee does not function in their church. Typical of replies in this category was the South Central pastor who confessed:

> We have no such committee. The churches in this city show very little active interest in the students, except that they want the students to attend their Sunday worship services which are not slanted especially towards the students.

Evidence here indicates that churches which do not maintain such a committee make it more difficult for the university parish pastor who tries to minister to students to do an effective piece of work than those churches which do support such a committee.

2. Relation to Other Student Movements

In question 2 the writer endeavored to find out how extensively the student organization of the local parish church at the college identifies itself with Conference, national, and international youth groups. Upon observation of returned data the writer discovered that 186 of the 224 pastors stated that their student groups were affiliated with the Methodist Student Movement, ninety-seven were affiliated in a participating relationship with the World's Student Christian Federation, eighty-eight claimed membership in the United Student Christian Council (now the National Student Christian Federation), 177 had a tie with the Boards of Education of their respective Annual Conferences, and 135 had a working relationship with an Inter-Conference Commission on Student Work. That so many are affiliated with the national organization of the Methodist Student Movement is not surprising, but that thirty-eight of the churches should claim

no affiliation with this group is a revelation. When one considers that membership of any Methodist college or university student group in the Methodist Student Movement is granted automatically merely by claiming such a relationship,[1] one wonders why as many as thirty-eight Methodist parish churches on the contemporary college scene fail to acknowledge such a relationship.

The highest percentage of churches affiliated with the Methodist Student Movement was accorded to the Western Jurisdiction with 91.7 per cent; whereas the lowest percentage was reported by the North Central area which scored 67.5 per cent. It is a healthful indication that 79 per cent of the churches concerned have a strong tie with their Annual Conference Boards of Education. That only 43.2 per cent of the churches involved have a participating relationship with a world federation of Christian students indicates room for improvement and need for encouragement of such affiliation with the ecumenical student movement by the local pastor.[2] About half the churches in all areas except Northeastern acknowledge affiliation with the World Student Christian Federation, but Northeastern shows only a 33 per cent kinship with this international student movement.[3]

---

[1]Methodist student groups gain membership in the World Student Christian Federation and in the National Student Christian Federation only through the membership in the Methodist Student Movement--not directly.

[2]Many Methodist students groups have such an affiliation, but it is not a direct connection. Hence they are unaware of it.

[3]Probably the reason for this score is because in the Northeast and in New York state the pattern for the work of the Student Christian Movement is on the cooperative level with churches and the Student Christian Associations.

Other significant findings from this data revealed that fifty-two of the local parish churches claim participating relationship with all five of the other student movements and organizations listed, whereas only sixteen claim no relationship with a single one of them.

3. The Financing of Student Work

There were two related questions in this block of inquiry, one of which dealt with funds for student work received from outside the local budget. The other question involved the local parish pastor's responsibility for assisting with financing the student-work program. These will be treated separately.

a. Source of funds for support of student work: In reply to question 3, it was determined that 67 per cent of the pastors responding indicated that their student groups received financial aid from sources outside the local church. There was considerable uniformity in this respect in that all five of the areas, with the exception of North Central, hovered within one-half of one per cent of the 69 per cent mark. Only the North Central Jurisdiction dropped below the mean here, with a registration of 61 per cent.

It would be natural to suspect that the chief source of help for student work from outside the local church would be the Annual Conferences. This was found to be true, with sixty-one pastors indicating the same. And it would seem likely that the Boards of Educations of the respective Annual Conferences would be heavy supporters of student work in a financial way. This also, was found to be true in that thirty conference Boards of Education help in this way. Support of inter-conference Boards

of Education could be listed in the same category. Eighteen of these instances were noted. Seventeen churches stated that they receive help from the headquarters of Methodist student work at Nashville. Five churches depend upon alumni for financial aid. Eight Committees on Area Student Work render material help. In six churches the Woman's Society of Christian Service gives assistance. At five churches the Methodist Student Movement lends financial aid. The university budget subsidizes five student-work programs. At four churches the solicitation of personal gifts is relied upon, and in three churches the work is underwritten in part by the budget of the local church. Doubtless there is some overlapping and duplication in these figures.

In two cities more than one church helps to finance student work. In one area two Districts are called upon for responsive monetary aid. Two pastors stated that they rely in part upon pledges by student members of the group. Two churches took advantage of the $5.00 plan, whereby the local churches were asked to send $5.00 per year for each student enrolled in college to the student-work program of the church near the campus where said student is enrolled.[1] At two churches Wesley Foundation Boards of Directors are invited to help. Listed once each in this connection were churches who relied upon a United Protestant Association, a Christian Education Higher Education Fund, and the Woman's Division of the Board of Missions. It is significant that there were twenty churches which

---

[1]It should be noted here that at the 1960 session of the General Conference the "$5.00 plan" was dropped in favor of a request of the Council on World Service and Finance for each Methodist church to set a minimum goal of $1.00 per year per member for higher education and 30¢ per year per member for Wesley Foundations (this to be increased later to $1.50 and 50¢, respectively).

reported that no financial assistance of any kind was received for the support of student work from outside the local church. Ten of these churches were from a single area--the North Central Jurisdiction.

b. Annual student group budgets: In answer to question 3b, which inquired as to the size of the budgets of the respective student groups, replies were summarized in Table 44. Although North Central registered the largest number of churches reporting, Western with 82.8 per cent, had the largest proportion of churches in relation to the total potential reporting on this item. North Central was second in percentage. Northeastern was third. Southeastern was fourth, and South Central ranked fifth in percentage. North Central claimed 34.4 per cent of the total budget reported by 163 churches in the nation; Southeastern was second with 23.3 per cent; South Central was third with 19.6 per cent; Western was fourth with 13.5 per cent; and Northeastern ranked last with 9.2 per cent of the total budget reported by 163 churches.

North Central also ranked highest for cumulative budget for a jurisdiction; moreover, it registered the highest average budget for churches in the nation, as well as the highest budget for all the churches in a jurisdiction. Southeastern ranked second in total budget reported, third in average budget of the reporting churches, and second in size of the average budget of all the churches in the area. South Central ranked third in total budget, second in average for the reporting churches, and third in size of the average budget of all churches in the jurisdiction. Western ranked fourth in all three of these categories, and Northeastern Jurisdiction was lowest in the same three categories.

TABLE 44

AMOUNT OF STUDENT-WORK BUDGETS

Jurisdiction	Number of churches reporting	Per cent of churches reporting	Total budget for area	Average per church reporting	Average per church in area
Western	29	82.8	$ 91,495	$3,155	$2,614
North Central	47	79.5	231,460	5,052	3,921
Northeastern	27	75.0	61.050	2,261	1,690
South Central	27	60.0	131,000	4,851	2,911
Southeastern	33	67.2	156,905	4,754	3,202
Totals	163	73.3[a]	$671,910	$4,120[a]	$3,000[a]

[a]Average for figures in column above

Amounts of budgets for student work ranged from a top of $41,000 by a single church in the Southeast Jurisdiction to a low of zero reported by two churches in the Western and North Central areas, respectively. By jurisdictions the variation from highest to lowest amounts expended for budget by individual churches for student work ranged as follows: Western, from $11,500 to zero; North Central, from $40,000 to zero; Northeastern, from $13,500 to $25; South Central, from $19,000 to $400; Southeastern from $41,000 to $35.[1]

[1]It should be pointed out that often the Wesley Foundation is officially considered the project of the Annual Conference and the Board of Education, rather than the local church. This might account for scanty budgets reported in some sections of the nation. Also, this factor accounts for most of the larger budgets. (They are not budgets of a single church; nevertheless, the local parish pastor has a responsibility to see that they are raised.)

A total of twenty-five pastors throughout the nation reported annual budgets of $10,000 or more per year. With nineteen of these twenty-five churches located in the North and South Central areas, 76 per cent of these larger budgets were tallied in the midwest. The largest number of churches reporting budgets of $10,000 or more was registered by the North Central area which tallied twelve such churches. Other jurisdictions which reported churches expending $10,000 or more for student work per year were reported as follows: South Central with seven, Southeastern with three, Western with two, and Northeastern with one church.

Indications are that the raising of the above funds for annual budgets is rarely simple or easy. It appears that the financing of even modest amounts presents problems; for example, the South Central pastor who reported that although the budget for this work at his church is only $500 per year, he has to secure some finances outside the church as well as within the local church budget. He stated that this is not an easy task and intimated that a good deal of the responsibility for the raising of these funds falls on his shoulders.

At Ohio State University an annual budget of $40,000 is raised by an area committee of the Annual Conferences involved in that section of the North Central Jurisdiction. A Wisconsin pastor described how a $34,000 annual budget is raised for student work in his parish as follows:

> The Student Association raises $5,000, including considerable receipts for meals, and contributes $500 per year to the Wesley Foundation Board. The local Methodist church contributes $3,600 for use of the building; and the balance of an annual budget of $34,000 is raised by the Wisconsin and West Wisconsin Conferences. The budget is administered by the Wesley Foundation Board which is the legal and financial body supported officially by the two conferences.

With money coming from so many different sources, some one must be responsible for coordinating the funds so that they are successfully channeled into the proper treasury. Although the above mentioned Wesley Foundation Board might be staffed with model directors, it is the experience of the writer as well as a number of experienced observers that often the responsibility for making many necessary decisions concerning finances is funneled through the pastor in charge of the local church.

c. Responsibility of the local pastor in raising funds: Answers to question 4, which inquired as to how much responsibility falls upon the shoulders of the pastor of the local church for the financing of student work, are summarized for visual observation in Table 45.

TABLE 45

HOW MUCH LOCAL PASTORS ARE RESPONSIBLE FOR FINANCING STUDENT WORK

	Considerable		Some		None	
Jurisdiction	Number	Per cent	Number	Per cent	Number	Per cent
Western	7	48.4	13	37.1	15	42.9
North Central	17	28.8	16	27.1	26	44.0
Northeastern	19	52.5	14	39.0	3	8.3
South Central	12	26.7	19	42.0	14	31.2
Southeastern	10	20.4	19	38.8	20	47.0
Totals	65	28.9[a]	81	36.0	78	35.1[a]

[a]Average of percentages

There appears to be fairly even distribution between jurisdictions as to whether considerable, some, or no responsibility falls upon the local

parish pastor for financing student work, with the edge going to the "some" category by a small percentage. A glance at this table reveals, however, that there is some variation between the jurisdictions in this matter.

For example, in the Northeast where we have found the least amount of student work being done by Methodists, a higher percentage of pastors are charged with considerable responsibility for raising financial support of student work. Second place in this respect is held by Western, third place by North Central, fourth place by South Central, and the least number of pastors who are "considerably" burdened with this responsibility reside in the Southeast. Does this indicate that budgets for student-work are raised most easily in the Southeast? There is not enough evidence here to support such a claim, but let us look at the "some" and the "none" column of the same area. Figures reveal that this jurisdiction ranks third in percentage of pastors who reported that they bear "some" responsibility, and highest in percentage of those who reported that they share no responsibility. From a study of the three categories as they relate to one another, it might be concluded that financial budgets are raised most easily in the Southeast. Anyway, these figures suggest that the local pastors of this jurisdiction have least to do with the financing of student work.

By the same reasoning, the Northeast has the most difficult time raising annual budgets for student work. Here most pastors have considerable responsibility, a moderate number of pastors have some responsibility, and the least number of pastors share no responsibility for raising student work finances.

Totals in Table 45 revealed that about 50 per cent more pastors throughout the nation share at least some responsibility for raising finances than those who bear no responsibility. This is a ratio of two to one and points up one of the most important administrative functions of the university parish pastor as he relates to student life.

Some comment between the lines was elicited by this question, and some samples of this comment are reproduced herewith as representative of returns from the separate jurisdictions. A North Central pastor wrote, "As chairman of the Board of Directors, I have considerable responsibility in selling the program to the conference and securing adequate appropriations each year." A Southeastern pastor stated, "Financing of the student program is included in the local church budget, but to be sustained there is need for the pastor to 'push the matter'." A South Central pastor's reply was characteristic of the need for the local pastor to bear this responsibility and merits quotation in full:

> The pastor must go before the Conference Board of Education and persuade that body as to the importance of the need of our student work, so that Board will include the sum which it figures it needs when appearing before the Conference Commission of World Service and Finance with its askings.

A Northeastern pastor said, "I must present the work to the Annual Conference." A representative of the Western area indicated that he must press the matter considerably because his church includes an amount equal to twenty-five cents on every dollar for Wesley Foundation in the local budget. One Western pastor reported that when the salary of the Wesley Foundation director was lagging his predecessor told the director that it was his job to raise his own salary. Although the Wesley Foundation

worker should bear some of the responsibility for raising the annual budget for his work, it would seem out of order for the senior pastor to ask him to solicit his own wages. How much more helpful is the attitude of the North Central pastor who stated, "I back up the minister to students in his askings."

4. The Parish Pastor and Public Relations

Questions relating to this category were two in number and dealt with (1) how much responsibility for public relations is borne by the local parish pastor as he discharges his administrative function, and (2) how much the pastor keeps in touch with the Department of College and University Religious Life of the Board of Education of The Methodist Church at Nashville. Table 46 summarizes returns to both of these queries.

TABLE 46

HOW MUCH LOCAL PASTORS BEAR RESPONSIBILITY FOR STUDENT-WORK PUBLIC RELATIONS

Questions[a]	Per cent considerable	Per cent some	Per cent none
5. How much responsibility for public relations falls on pastor?	43.3	38.8	16.9
6. How much do you keep in touch with the Department of College and University Religious Life at Nashville?	19.2	62.0	18.8

[a]The identifying numbers refer to questions on the questionnaire. See Appendix A, p. 527.

a. Responsibility for public relations: In answer to question 5, Table 46 gives a graphic description of returned data. More than four-fifths of the pastors across the nation agreed that they should shoulder at least some responsibility for public relations in connection with student work. Less than one in five thought that it was not their responsibility, and those who thought that they should bear a considerable portion of the responsibility outnumbered those who considered that they should bear only some of the responsibility. Northeastern pastors appeared to be most conscientious about this matter, as 61.2 per cent of them said that the pastor should bear considerable responsibility. Three other areas hovered together around the 46 per cent mark in this respect: Western, South Central, and Southeastern. North Central was lowest in this category with a showing of 30.6 per cent.

North Central was also lowest of the five areas in percentage of pastors who thought that they had "some" responsibility in this matter, and South Central rated the highest percentage of pastors in this column. With North Central's contribution of twenty-four of the total number of thirty-eight pastors who say that the local pastor has no business attending to public relations for the student group in the parish church, this poor showing could mean one of two things: either (1) that he isn't interested in student work, or (2) that the work is so well organized that it is not necessary for him to be primarily interested with this part of his administrative function. One would be more inclined to lean towards the latter judgment, since student work seems to be well established in the North Central area. One pastor of a Northeastern church stated that he depends heavily for this service upon the Secretary of Student Work of

the local Woman's Society of Christian Service. This appears to be a valid and valuable service which might be rendered by such an officer in the Woman's Society of the campus-related church.

b. Keeping in touch with headquarters at Nashville: In reply to question 6, which inquired as to how much the university parish pastor keeps in touch with the Division of Higher Education of the Board of Education of the Methodist Church, a glance at Table 46 reveals that less than one in five keeps "considerable" touch with Nashville. Nearly two-thirds of the pastors keep somewhat in touch, and less than one in five have virtually no communication with national headquarters. In regard to this matter, it appears that pastors of the North Central area are more conscientious. They lead the nation with 23.8 per cent of their pastors feeling that this question demands considerable attention; whereas South Central, with only 9 per cent of their pastors feeling the same way, rates lowest among the jurisdictions in regard to this question.

Since nearly two-thirds of the pastors were grouped in the "some" category, perhaps an analysis of this segment of data will render significant meaning. Two areas, Northeastern and Southeastern, led in this regard with 69.2 per cent and 67.2 per cent, respectively. The remaining three jurisdictions were grouped closely together around the 60 to 62 per cent mark. Variation among the number of pastors who felt that they have no particular business keeping in touch with the national headquarters of the Methodist Student Movement ranged from South Central, which led with a percentage of 29, to Northeastern which boasted a corporate percentage of only 8.3.

In weighing data returned in answer to this question, the reader must keep in mind that some student work is so well organized that there is not much need for the preaching pastor to keep in close communication with Nashville. Also, at some university parishes student work is so set up that the student worker or Foundation director is able to take care of much Nashville correspondence.

There were few written comments provoked by this question. However, a South Central pastor remarked that his Wesley Foundation Director, who is not the preaching pastor, is able to handle most of the correspondence with Nashville. Despite the dearth of written reactions to this question, there did not appear to be any opposition to leadership provided by the Division of Higher Education, and a Southeastern pastor noted, "We gladly receive their guidance." A Western pastor's reaction was, "I see little reason for keeping in touch with Nashville," and yet his local budget for student work demands a sum of $8,240 annually. One Western pastor who confided that he is a member of the Curriculum Committee of the Board of Education of the Methodist Church, appropriately reported that he is in constant communication with national headquarters concerning the needs of his local student group. From these data one gets a general impression that the national headquarters of the Methodist Student Movement at Nashville functions so capably and so cooperatively that little communication about it is required. This would appear to be a compliment to the operation of the Division of Higher Education at Nashville, which these data in no way refute.

5. Relationships with the University Faculty

There were two major questions in the block of queries dealing with faculty relationships. Data were returned in answer to question 7 which inquired about local organizations of Methodist faculty members; and data were also returned in answer to question 8 which asked about the organization of the Faculty Christian Fellowship on local campuses. Data that are relevant to these returns are summarized in Table 47.

TABLE 47

PASTOR'S RELATIONSHIPS TO FACULTY ORGANIZATIONS

Questions[a]	Number answering "Yes"	Per cent
7. Do you have an organization of Methodist Faculty members?	22	9.8
8. Do you have a Faculty Christian Fellowship on your campus?	37	16.5
8a. If not, would you consider helping to organize one?	94	43.2

[a]The identifying numbers refer to questions on the questionnaire. See Appendix A, p. 527.

a. Organization of Methodist faculty members: According to Table 43, a little less than one in ten pastors indicated that there was any type of organization of Methodist faculty members on their respective campuses. The twenty-two pastors who reported affirmatively were distributed as following: Western with three, North Central with six, Northeastern with five, South Central with three, and Southeastern with five. Northeastern leads the areas in the highest percentage of Methodist

faculty groups which are organized into a fellowship. South Central ranks lowest in this regard. On one Northeastern campus there is an organization of Methodist faculty members reported, but it is conducted on an informal basis.

b. Number of Faculty Christian Fellowship groups: In answer to question 8, Table 47 reveals that thirty-seven pastors reported Faculty Christian Fellowship groups on their campuses. These were distributed as follows: Western with eight, or 22.8 per cent; North Central with fourteen, or 23.8 per cent; Northeastern with none, or zero per cent; South Central with eight, or 17.7 per cent; and Southeastern with seven, or 14.3 per cent. North Central leads in this category by a single per cent over Western, and the opposite pole of this tabulation is occupied by Northeastern which did not report a single organized fellowship.

Written comments were couched in a negative vein. For example, a Southeastern pastor said, "There seems to be little if any interest in such an organization here." From the same area a pastor replied that the organization of such a fellowship had been discussed, but that no final action had been taken. At another Southeastern campus there is a Faculty Christian Fellowship, but the local clergy are not invited to attend as guests. At still another Southeastern situation there is an organization of faculty members, but since the school is a Baptist college, only two Methodist faculty members belong to the fellowship. Most of the students and the faculty at this school are loyal to the Baptist program. One North Central pastor confessed that he did not know whether such an organization existed on his campus, and another pastor from the same area

said, "I doubt that one could be formed here." A Northeastern pastor stated, "We don't have the organization here, but many know about it because I send in their names and they receive the official publication of the fellowship."

c. Willingness of pastors to organize Faculty Christian Fellowships: Also, according to Table 47, in response to question 8a which inquired whether parish pastors would consider helping to organize the Faculty Christian Fellowship on an interdenomination basis at schools where this body had not yet been formed, nearly one-half of the respondents indicated affirmatively. On a jurisdictional basis the ninety-four pastors who answered, "Yes," to this question were distributed like this: Western had seventeen, or 48.8 per cent of the pastors from that area; North Central tallied seventeen, or 28.8 per cent; Northeastern responded with eighteen, or 50 per cent; South Central scored nineteen, or 42.2 per cent; and Southeastern accounted twenty-three, or 46.8 per cent. Thus it is observed that Northeastern leads in this category with half of its pastors indicating their willingness to organize these groups, and North Central indicates that it is least willing to organize them. In weighing the latter figures the reader should bear in mind that the North Central Jurisdiction had many faculty fellowships already organized.

Data revealing the scarcity of Faculty Christian Fellowships on campuses throughout the nation and the less-than-willing attitude of the local Methodist pastor to help organize such a group point up one or both of two evils. Either (1) there is widespread ignorance among pastors as to the value of such an organization, and/or (2) there is a disapointing

proportion of pastors at such stations who are willing to expend the time and effort needed to assist in the cultivation of such a fellowship on the local campus. The writer is inclined to conclude that the first evil prevails in greater proportion than the second. If it is true that college teachers shape the basic thought-patterns and attitudes of their students towards philosophy, history, literature, science, and all the various disciplines of knowledge, then how important it is that the faculty become exposed to the possibilities of teaching their respective disciplines according to the implications of religion. When the philosopher, the scientist, the historian, the anthropologist, and other teaching specialists in their respective disciplines of knowledge are willing to get together informally in a company wherein they recognize one another as peers, and allow their basic presuppositions to be challenged in the light of claims of the Christian enterprise, it is amazing to note how presumed conflict between science and religion disappears and how such a point of view may be passed along to students in the classroom. This is, in part, the purpose and program of the Faculty Christian Fellowship. Without a doubt this organization presents one of the most fruitful fields of evangelism open to the university parish pastor. He should study the valuable contributions which can be made by the Fellowship on his campus, and work for the establishment of such an organization where it is lacking. While it would appear presumptious on his part to more than indirectly suggest the desirability of forming such an organization, he could begin with the Methodist faculty personnel who are members of his church. It would be his prerogative to encourage a fellowship within this group, whether formal or informal. He could also acquaint them with the plan of the Faculty Christian Fellowship.

By demonstrating the merits of The Christian Scholar (official journal of the movement) and through encouraging the interest of his own faculty members in the organization, on their initiative the larger and more comprehensive Fellowship might be formed.

In this connection it is especially important that the parish pastor be aware of the importance of the organizing of a Faculty Christian Fellowship at graduate schools where educational specialists are "shaping" the techniques of college teachers who will, in turn, go out to the universities of the world to shape the moral and intellectual destiny of college students. It is important that these teachers of teachers should be acquainted with the possibilities of teaching their respective disciplines according to the implications of religion, and it is agreed that the Faculty Christian Fellowship provides the best single source of such information.

6. Relation to United, Inter-faith, and Other Groups

Data which were returned in answer to this block of three questions are summarized in part in Table 48, and an analysis of these figures is presented herewith.

TABLE 48

HOW MUCH PASTORS PARTICIPATE IN OTH R WAYS

Questions[a]	Per cent answering "Considerable"	Per cent answering "some"	Per cent answering "none"
9a. How much do you participate in a United Protestant student group on your campus?	15.6	27.7	56.7
10a. How much do you participate in an Inter-faith group on your campus?	11.6	15.3	73.1
11. How much do you serve as a "Middleman" in synthesizing religion and academic disciplines on your campus?	8.5	48.2	43.3

[a]The identifying numbers refer to questions on the questionnaire. See Appendix A, p. 527.

a. United Protestant groups: In answer to question 9, which inquired as to the presence of united Protestant groups on respective campuses, there were 121 pastors who answered, "Yes," for an affirmative reply of 54 per cent of the pastors across the nation. Pastors who voted, "Yes," on this question were tallied by jurisdictions as follows: Western with twenty-one, or 60 per cent of its pastors; North Central with thirty-one, or 52.5 per cent of its pastors; Northeastern with twenty-five, or 69.1 per cent; South Central with twenty-three, or 45 per cent; and Southeastern with twenty-one, or 21 per cent of its pastors. The highest score was rated by Northeastern,[1] and lowest was reported by Southeastern. This clearly indicates that such groups find favor most in the Northeast and least popularity in the Southeast, with the remaining three jurisdictions fluctuating between 43 to 60 per cent.

On the campus of a Northeastern school the function of this group is carried on by the Student Christian Association. At a North Central institution the functions of this group are performed by a Campus Religious Council. Another North Central school, which tried it once, found it "weak and confusing" and gave it up. In the Southeastern area one school carries on the functions of this group through a Center for Religious Activities which the local Methodist pastor describes as interdenominational in character.

b. Participation in United Protestant groups: A glance at data returned from question 9a, which are summarized in Table 47, revealed that about one pastor in six participated considerably in a United Protestant

---

[1] Ibid.

group. Nearly twice as many pastors participated "some" as participated "considerably," and somewhat more than one-half of the pastors did not participate at all in this group. Because the number of non-participating pastors would naturally be somewhat determined by the number of these groups on campuses across the nations, a review of returns from question 11 enables the observer to draw the following conclusions. All of the pastors in the Western area who reported such groups were identified at least "some" with them. About half of the pastors in the Southeast who reported such groups on the local campus are identified with them. In the remaining three jurisdictions 80 per cent of the university parish ministers who reported such groups on their campuses stated that they participate in their programs at least somewhat. In Western, North Central, and Northeastern pastors who participated were equally divided between the "considerable" and the "some" categories; in South Central only 21 per cent of those who participate at all are in the "considerable" column; and in the Southeastern area all pastors who participate do so "some" and none "considerably." One South Central pastor wrote, "Participation by the counsellors in this group is considerable, but participation by students and others is quite casual and only occasional."

c. Inter-Faith groups: In response to question 10, which inquired as to the presence of an inter-faith group on respective campuses, there were eighty-nine pastors who answered, "Yes," for an affirmative reply of 39.6 per cent. The tally of pastors who voted, "Yes," on this question throughout the respective jurisdictions is summarized as follows: Western with fifteen, or 42.8 per cent of its pastors; North Central with twenty-seven, or 45.6 per cent, Northeastern with fourteen, or 38.8 per cent;

South Central with fourteen, or 31 per cent; and Southeastern with nineteen, or 49 per cent. Highest percentage, as with the united Protestant groups, was found in the Northeastern Jurisdiction; and the lowest percentage was reported by South Central pastors.

There was scattered comment regarding the way this group functions. One North Central pastor stated that his college refused to allow this group to be recognized on the local campus, but that such intolerance was the exception rather than the rule. At least a half-dozen other titles designating the same sort of organization were reported, among them the following: "Inter-Religious Council," "Interdenominational Coordinating Council," "University Religious Council," and "Interdenominational Center for Religious Activities." At a South Central school inter-faith relations on the campus were handled satisfactorily by the Y.W.C.A., and at a North Central institution the inter-faith group included the Greek Orthodox.

d. Participation in inter-faith groups: According to returns from question 10a, which are also summarized in Table 48, nearly three-quarters of the pastors did not participate in any kind of inter-faith group on their respective campuses. Of pastors who did participate, the ratio of those who are somewhat identified as compared to those who are considerably identified was about three to two. Again, it must be borne in mind that there is correlation between the small number of participants in this organization and the fact that there is only a 40 per cent registration of such an organization at schools which are identified with this study.

There was some areawide variation in data returned in answer to this question. This variation ranged from the West, where about 50 per cent

of the pastors reported that they participated at least "some," to the Southeast where only one in six pastors designated that he participated at least somewhat. Southeast reported only two pastors in the "considerably" category, which was the least number enumerated among the jurisdictions. One South Central pastor who is affiliated with the inter-faith group on his campus said that several pastors show up when an outstanding denominationalist is scheduled to speak.

That there should be such a high percentage of pastors answering "none" in answer to questions 9a and 10a (as visualized in Table 48) is of sufficient significance to note. These figures might explain the apparent lack of local ecumenicity which the World Council of Churches and the National Council of Churches continually deplores.

e. Serving as "middleman": In reply to question 11, which inquired as to how much the Methodist university parish pastor serves as a "middleman" in synthesizing religion and the various academic disciplines of higher education on respective campuses, a review of the final tabulation in Table 48 revealed that slightly more than two-fifths of the pastors do not serve in this capacity at all; about half of them serve to some extent; and less than one in ten does so "considerably." Numerical tally of these data revealed nineteen in the "considerable" column, 108 in the "some" column, and ninety-seven in the "none" category. There was a variation of only ten per cent between the areas showing the highest number of pastors who participated somewhat in this activity. Most participation was in the West with 63 per cent, and least participation was in the Northeast and Southeast which reported 53 per cent activity.

7. Matters of Appointment and Status

Data from this final block of inquiry on page 7 of the instrument were tallied in response to questions 12 and 13 which asked pastors to reflect attitudes or opinions regarding (1) appointment of pastors to a university parish pulpit as a "special calling," and (2) how much security or status should be expected for pastors who prepare for such a specialized ministry. Table 49 explains national returns in summary form.

TABLE 49

OPINIONS OF PASTORS ABOUT APPOINTMENT TO UNIVERSITY PARISH PULPITS

Questions[a]	Number answering "Yes"	Per cent
12. Should appointment to a university parish pastorate receive consideration as a "special calling?"	185	82.5
13. When a Pastor trains for a university parish and does acceptable work, should he expect "reasonable security" or status in such a type of an appointment under our Methodist system?	178	79.5

[a]The identifying numbers refer to questions on the questionnaire. See Appendix, p. 527.

a. A "special calling?" In answer to question 12, which asked pastors whether they felt that appointment to a university parish church should receive special consideration by the Bishop and Cabinet as a "special calling," 185 preachers across the nation expressed an affirmative opinion. According to Table 49, this represents more than four-fifths of the pastors in the United States who are concerned with this

study. Examination of returns from the separate jurisdictions revealed that there was not wide variation from the norm in any area. The percentage tally by jurisdictions was noted as follows: Southeastern was high with an 89.5 per cent affirmative response indicated from forty-four of the forty-nine respondents who dwell in that area. Next came Western with an 85.5 per cent favorable response, representing thirty affirmative opinions out of a possible thirty-five. Third place was claimed by South Central which reported 82 per cent, or a positive expression of thirty-seven pastors out of forty-five. In fourth place was Northeastern with 80.5 per cent, totaling twenty-nine "Yes" votes from thirty-six respondents. Last place was claimed by North Central with 76.2 per cent, or a return of 45 favorable votes from the fifty-nine respondents stationed in that jurisdiction.

A Western pastor said that a Methodist preacher, under our present system, should expect no more status at a university parish pulpit than in many other situations. A North Central pastor stated, "A flat 'Yes' to this question is impossible; it depends upon the particular situation involved." A South Central preacher said, "Bishops that I know are delighted to help pastors who consider themselves 'called,' but the 'called one' in this sense should not expect the protection implied."

Another South Central preacher remarked, "There are too many pastors seeking protection under the guise of 'special callings,'" and added that he has no acquaintance with any instance where the Methodist system is unfair to university parish pastors as it operates now. Another respondent from the same area indicated that the university parish pastor can serve such a post better as a connecting link with the outside world

if he is not specifically trained as a "university type pastor." A final objection to this question was voiced by a southern preacher who cautioned, "Consider the effects if such a title of 'special calling' were applied to other categories of preacher--like city pastors, town and country preachers, etc." He was of the opinion that pastors should drift in and out of the university parish pastorate for the good of all concerned, because, in his words, "experiences in other categories make one a better university pastor while he is serving such a post."

Other replies include this contribution from a Southeastern pastor who said, "Such appointments should be considered separately because not every pastor can function adequately in such a station." A North Central pastor believed that appointment to such a post should receive "special consideration." Qualified "Yeses" were given by a Northeastern pastor who stated, "In some cases," and by a North Central respondent who claimed, "Some special consideration should be shown by the Cabinet in choosing men for such places, but there is no call to make a big thing [sic] out of it." A South Central pastor said that this appointment needs the special attention of the Cabinet insofar as they will select a man for the job who has "a definite interest in students, and an alert mind, as well as intellectual interests combined with practical ability." Another South Central pastor expressed himself affirmatively this way, "In a university parish pastorate where there is a healthy balance between students and non-students, the pastor needs to be a man who can serve both."

b. Security or status: Data returned in answer to question 13, which invited the opinions of pastors as to whether a pastor who trains for a university parish pastorate and does acceptable work at such a post

should expect some security or status in this type of appointment under the Methodist system, are also summarized in Table 49. A Total of 178 pastors, representing about four out of five of all the respondents in the nation, answered this question affirmatively. Nationwide returns to this question were nearly identical to returns from question 12. Area-wide, with a single exception, there was no variation between the percentage totals of answers to this question and answers to the preceding query. Percentage rankings established by the jurisdictions in descending order of value were: Southeastern, North Central, South Central, Northeastern, and Western. (In returns from question 12 Western ranked in second place and North Central ranked in fifth place.)

Thirteen written comments expressing a negative opinion on this matter merit a hearing which is herewith presented in comprehensive summary according to area distribution. A Western pastor who denies the right to ask such a question said, "There is no such thing as expecting security or status in the Methodist Church. One has to earn it himself." Another Western pastor stated, "A Methodist preacher will get the status he earns. His security is in the Annual Conference, not in a local situation." A third Westerner cautioned, "The Bishop should not be limited in his appointive power."

A North Central pastor who takes a traditional view said, "As a Methodist elder I figure I am subject to appointment anywhere." Another pastor from the same section remarked, "He should no more expect it than urban and rural pastors." A third North Central pastor said that he should have no more security than any other pastor. He added, "He must come under the connectional system and be moved when he is no longer

effective." Another from the same area said, "In a small conference like ours, which has only three college parishes, this would pose a considerable problem." Still another North Central pastor saw little logic in the question and remarked, "All conference members have reasonable security and status under our Methodist system, so why worry about this?" A Northeasterner was of the opinion that such a pastor has no more right to status or security "than any other Methodist minister, so long as recognition of ability and achievement is given."

A South Central pastor was convinced that the question smacks of favoritism, which he is against. He said, "This would set a special type of pastors off against pastors of 'special type churches' other than college churches." Another from the same jurisdiction replied, "Students are people and not some sort of 'special animals'," implying that they do not need any special type of pastor other than the average "run-of-the mill" Methodist traveling preacher. One Southeastern pastor who gives a qualified, "No," makes this explanation, "I have to vote 'no' on this one, but I think an Annual Conference would be unwise to ignore the training of a pastor who had prepared himself for such a job."

A final registration of protest was raised by a Southeastern pastor whose entire quotation merits reproduction:

> Special consideration should be given in making appointments which minister to students. However, I don't know that I would want to spend all my life in a college situation. I feel that my call to the ministry was to people, not just to one group of persons. This is one thing I enjoy about the Methodist ministry. I have ministered to a suburban church, and now to a larger congregation in a college town. I fear too much specialization in the ministry. I prefer a dedicated ministry--hard working and consecrated, anxious to study and to keep abreast of the day; able to minister to all groups.

Although there were only eight written affirmative comments in rebuttal to the foregoing negative conclusions, as one observes the data from these returns he gets a feeling that the following expressions are representative of the substantial majority who voted in favor of the question as stated. Some of the positive statements are condensed herewith:

A Western pastor who is numbered among the majority favoring the question justified his opinion in this wise, "A man who can cut it with the students should serve them. If he is a capable man he should be used in university parish pastor work." A North Central pastor indicated that IF a pastor trains especially for such a job and becomes effective in it he should receive "special consideration for such an appointment." Another pastor from the same area gave a qualified, "Yes," as he underlined the works "reasonable security," indicating that a man at this post should have as much security as the average well-trained Methodist pastor.

A third North Central pastor pointed out that most of the regulations for appointments in the Methodist system are for the "AVERAGE church," and there can be found exceptions to the rule which do not fit all churches. He was inclined to believe that the demands of such a post are "different" enough to merit special consideration, and, all things being considered, "some status to such men." A third pastor from the same area who responded with a qualified, "Yes," said, "Such a pastor would probably expect some security, but he wouldn't necessarily get it or deserve it if he didn't earn it." Another North Central preacher concluded, "He already has 'reasonable security' just as any member of the conference who does his work well has. He should not be given a special 'prestige payment' just for being pastor at such a post."

A Northeastern respondent said, "He should have status, but he should also be movable." A South Central pastor voted, "Yes," on this question, but qualified his answer with this observation, "I judge it quite possible (1) to become so specialized as to regard students hardly as 'people', and (2) to regard ego so narcissically as to become assinine." A final comment is hardly covered by the question, but it is included here for what it is worth because it suggests a creative way in which this problem can be handled at some situations. A Northeastern pastor contributed, "We are adding a retired man to our staff as part time minister to students. He is uniquely qualified, and we can see no reason why he should not receive reasonable security and some status in his job."

A rewording of this question separating the word "security" from the word "status" might have elicited a different reply and come closer to the heart of the matter. There are some pastors who might question running the two together, i.e., he ought to expect a measure of security but not ask for status. No Methodist minister need be overly concerned about status.

B. Summary

A suitable frame for the picture of the typical university parish pastor has been contributed by an analysis of his administrative function as he relates to student life. The probabilities are about two to one that his church relates to student life through the use of some form of Campus-Church Relations committee. There is an 83 per cent possibility that his student group has a relationship with the Methodist Student Movement; but his student group registers only a 43 per cent chance of being vitally related to an ecumenical youth movement.

The annual budget of his student group is $3,000, and his administrative function becomes an important role because the probability is better than two to one that his student group depends upon financial support from sources outside the local church. Therefore, it becomes a major responsibility on his part to promote the solicitation of such funds. There is an 83 per cent possibility that he bears at least some of the responsibility for public relations in connection with student work at his church; and there is an 80 per cent probability that he feels that at least some contact with the Division of Higher Education at Nashville should be maintained.

He stands one chance in ten of being related to an organization of Methodist faculty members on his campus and about one chance in six of being identified with a Faculty Christian Fellowship, but his inclination to help organize such a fellowship where none exists is measured at 43 per cent. Although the possibility of the existance of a united Protestant student group on his campus is 56 per cent, the probabilities of his participating in such a student movement are only 46 per cent. While there are inter-faith groups on 40 per cent of the campuses measured in the study, the probability of his being identified with this organization was measured at 27 per cent. The chances are against his feeling inclined to serve as a middleman in synthesizing religion and the academic disciplines on his campus by a ratio of three to two.

He is almost fully persuaded that appointment to a university parish pastorate should be regarded somewhat in the nature of a special calling, and he equally shares the opinion that when a pastor trains for a university parish and does acceptable work he ought to expect a

reasonable degree of security or status at such a type of station under the Methodist appointive system.[1]

Now that the seven pages of data returned in answer to the questionnaire have been summarized, it is presumed that further learning may be gained from cross-tabulation of some of these findings. To facilitate such a sub-study within the structure of the over-all study of this dissertation, the next chapter will deal with correlation of pertinent data through cross-tabulation in important areas suggested by the preceding analysis. Chapter XVI will be concerned with five areas of cross-tabulation.

---

[1] In review of the matter of the university parish pastor's "security" which assumes some prominence because of the listing of question number 13 under the function of Administration of page seven of the questionnaire (see Appendix A, p. 527), the writer hereby acknowledges that so many of the comments returned by respondents probably focus too much on the status of the pastor, the powers of the bishop and the peculiar nature of the Methodist itinerancy to the exclusion of consideration of a better ministry to the college community. Returns from these data are disturbing, and critical reference to them will be reserved for summation on page 504 in the final chapter.

CHAPTER XVI

SOME SIGNIFICANT CROSS-TABULATIONS

The writer selected five areas for correlation which indicated that they might yield profitable material. These areas which are presented in this chapter are: (1) a comparing and contrasting of the records of thirty-one pastors who have served for a number of years at university parish churches with the records of thirty-one pastors who are serving their first years at such a station; (2) a cross-tabulation of the records of sixteen pastors who have had specialized training for student work with the records of sixteen pastors who have not had such training; (3) a comparison of the records of twenty-two pastors who teach college courses for credit with the records of twenty-two pastors who do not teach such courses; (4) a correlation of the records of twenty-one pastors whose student groups do considerable visitation membership enlistment among students with the records of twenty-one pastors whose student groups who do no such visitation enlistment; and (5) a comparison of the similarities and differences between the records of sixteen pastors whose churches have no such committee. The chapter will be concluded with a summary statement concerning the findings of the cross-tabulations.

A. Correlation of the Records of Thirty-one "Older" Thirty-one "Younger" Pastors

Two groups of pastors were chosen to complete the first cross-tabulation. These groups will be designated as "older" pastors who have

served at a university parish church or churches for a period of fourteen years or longer, and "younger" pastors who are relatively new in years of service at a campus-related Methodist church. At the outset one might assume that the more years of experience and the more training of the "older" pastors at a university situation might result in a better showing than produced by the "younger" pastors with limited training and years of experience at a college church.

In order to discover whether data at hand confirm or deny such an assumption, the records of the 224 pastors who responded to this study were searched and the writer discovered that a total of thirty-one pastors across the nation had served fourteen years or longer at one or more university stations. These represent the "older" pastors which make up one group for cross-tabulation in this section of the study. The reader will bear in mind that these men are not necessarily older in age, but that they have had more years of seniority at college situations than the second group of pastors which was chosen for comparison and contrast. By jurisdictions the number of these thirty-one "older" pastors and their respective years of service at a university parish were established as follows:

The Western Jurisdiction had six pastors who had served from fourteen to twenty-four at university parish pastorates. Three of these pastors claimed fourteen years of service at a college-related church, one claimed fifteen years at such a post, one claimed sixteen years, and one claimed twenty-four years of service. Two of these men had served their entire college-ministry at one church. Three men had been appointed to two university situations. The veteran of twenty-four years of service had divided his college-ministry between four pulpits.

North Central Jurisdiction tallied a total of ten "older" pastors ranging from fourteen to thirty-two years of service with records noted as follows: three had served for fourteen years, two for sixteen years, two for nineteen years, and one each for twenty, twenty-four, and thirty-two years, respectively. One pastor had spent his entire college ministry at a single parish, five had held two university churches, three had been appointed to three such churches, and one minister had served in four university situations.

In the Northeast there were four pastors who reported fourteen years or more of service at a university station, one reported fifteen years, and three reported eighteen years. One had spent his entire ministry at the same college church, and the remaining three had been appointed to three successive university communities.

The South Central Jurisdiction claimed a total of five ministers who had spent fourteen years or longer at a university parish church. One pastor reported fifteen years of service at such a station, one reported sixteen years, two reported seventeen years, and one reported twenty-one years. Two of these pastors had expended their years in this type of work at a single church. One pastor had served in two college situations. Another pastor had been appointed to four similar stations, and a fifth pastor had divided his ministry between five university communities.

The Southeast Jurisdiction, which claimed six pastors in the selected category, reported two pastors in the fourteen year bracket, one in the sixteen year division, and one each in the nineteen, twenty-five, and twenty-nine year classifications. Two pastors of this area had spent their entire university pastorate at a single church--one of

them for twenty-five years. One pastor had served two college churches. One pastor had served three college churches, and two pastors had spent their time at four university parishes.

A second group of pastors, whom we shall designate as "younger" pastors, was chosen for the purpose of comparing and contrasting respective records on the field. For this group exactly thirty-one were chosen from pastors across the nation who were serving their second year in their first appointments at a university situation. They were chosen by lot and proportionately distributed among the respective jurisdictions as follows: five from the Western Jurisdiction, eight from North Central, five from Northeastern, six from South Central, and seven from the Southeastern area. Resultant data from this cross-tabulation would be more meaningful if the writer had been able to "match" the sizes and types of churches and colleges served by the "older" pastors with the sizes and types of churches and colleges served by the "younger" pastors. But invariably the churches and colleges served by the "older" pastors were so different from those served by most of the "younger" pastors that it was impossible to structure such a correlation.

Cross-tabulation of data regarding selected areas of achievement of these two control-groups are summarized in Tables 50, 51, and 52 of this chapter. Since these three tables concern related phases of the total study, they need to be examined in close relationship one with another. The reader is advised to withold judgment until all the facts have been weighed and final correlation has been made between figures presented by both groups in all three tables.

TABLE 50

RECORDS OF 31 "OLDER" AND 31 "YOUNGER" PASTORS

	Areas of achievement	"Older" pastors		"Younger" pastors	
		Number	Per cent	Number	Per cent
1.	Students reached vitally	5,480	14.7	1,781	16.4
2.	Average per church reached vitally	176	14.7	57	16.4
3.	Students reached casually	9,635	26.0	2,977	27.9
4.	Average per church reached casually	311	26.0	96	27.9
5.	Total students reached	15,115	41.0	4,758	44.6
6.	Average per church of total reached	488	41.0	153	44.6
7.	Full members enrolled in church	1,033	2.8	436	4.6
8.	Average number of full members enrolled per church	33	2.8	14	4.6
9.	Affiliate members enrolled	1,735	4.5	1,093	4.8
10.	Average number of affiliate members per church	54	4.5	35	4.8
11.	Total both kinds of members	2,768	7.5	1,529	14.3
12.	Average number of both kinds of members per church	89	7.5	49	14.3

1. Analysis of Service and Membership Records

This portion of the study begins with comparing and contrasting the pastoral records of thirty-one "older" pastors with the records of thirty-one "younger" pastors in the following areas of achievement: (1) the number of Methodist-preference students reached by the ministry of the university parish pastor, and (2) the number of students who are recorded as members on the roll of his church. The analysis of these data is facilitated by a summary presented in Table 50.

a) Students reached through the pastor's ministry: According to item one of Table 50, the thirty-one pastors of the "older" group reported that a total of 5,480 of the Methodist-preference students on their respective campuses were vitally reached through their ministry. This figure represents 14.7 per cent of the total number of Methodist-preference students listed on the campuses of the thirty-one colleges and universities served by this group. In contrast to this number, only about one-third as many, or 1,781 were reached vitally by pastors in the "younger" group. But the writer points out here that because the "younger" pastors had fewer Methodist-preference students in their respective parishes they were really reaching 16.4 per cent of their potential in a vital relationship.

It has been established that the typical Methodist university parish pastor reaches with his campus ministry an average of 87.8 students vitally.[1] Using this mean figure as an instrument for measurement, it appears that the "older" pastor is turning in approximately double the performance of the typical pastor; whereas the

---

[1] Above, p. 214.

"younger" pastor is only performing up to 65 per cent of the typical pastor's capabilities. And since it has been established that the mean number of church members (both full and affiliate) who are enrolled at the church of the composite pastor is 49.5,[1] it appears that the "older" pastor has nearly doubled that figure--whereas the "younger" pastor scarcely comes up to the average.

However, before the observer concludes that the "older" pastor is doing his job three times as effectively in this regard as the "younger" pastor, he should observe the percentage figures denoting the effectiveness of the two groups. Since the "younger" pastors have less than one-third as many Methodist-preference students on their respective campuses (their institutions are smaller in size), and although the "younger" pastors reach considerably fewer students vitally than do the "older" pastors, they are doing a 16.4 per cent job with what material they have, in comparison with the 14.7 percentage rating of the "older" pastors.

Item 2 of Table 50 reveals that the average number of students reached vitally by the "older" pastor was more than three times as large as the number of students reached in the same fashion by the "younger" pastor, with the same percentage as revealed in item 1. It is reasonable to conclude that the "older" pastors ought to be reaching a larger number of students vitally than the "younger" pastors because they have more than three times as many Methodist-preference students with which to work.

Items 3 and 4 of Table 50 indicate the comparative number of students and their percentage of the available Methodist-preference

---

[1]Above, p. 215.

students who are reached casually by "older" and "younger" pastors. Again, it is observed that although the "older" pastors reached more than three times as many students casually as did the "younger" pastors, from an analysis of the percentage column it would appear that in reality the "younger" pastor is working harder at his job.

Observation of items 5 and 6 of Table 50 reveals that the total number of students reached both vitally and casually by the "older" pastors outnumbers the total number reached by their juniors at about the same proportion of ver three to one. But, again, the table reveals that the senior pastors are doing a 41 per cent job with what they have to work on; whereas the "younger" pastors appear to be turning in a 44.6 per cent performance.

b) Students recorded on church roll: Items 7 through 12 of Table 50 present a resumé of the comparative number of student church members whose names were recorded on the church rolls of the two groups of pastors. Since some pastors do not recognize the affiliate relation, and again since some pastors record all of their student members in the affiliate classification, the totals of these categories present a truer picture than either the "full" or the "affiliate" totals. Both sets of figures were presented in this table so that the complete story of this relationship could be visually portrayed.

It appears that the senior pastors are outdoing their juniors by a two and three to one margin in the matter of enlisting student-members on the church roll; but again, as one considers the more limited resources of the "younger" pastors, it appears as though the latter are working harder at serving the needs of students. The reader

is asked to withhold judgment regarding this phase of ministry to students until further analysis can be made relating to additional data supplied in the next two tables.

2. Analysis of Additional Areas of Achievement

Ten additional areas of achievement by the "older" and "younger" pastors were selected for comparison and contrast in this section. Cross-tabulation of data returned in relation to these areas is summarized in Table 51.

a) Pastors who possess doctorate: Of the seventeen pastors who possessed the doctoral degree among the thirty-one "older" men, it is significant that fourteen of these seventeen held the degree of Doctor of Divinity, an honorary degree; whereas only three possessed the equivalent of a Ph.D. degree. On the other hand, both doctorates that were reported among the "younger" pastors were of the earned Ph.D. degree variety. It is significant that so many of the "older" men have received the honorary title "Doctor," because it indicates that they are numbered among the mature and venerated leaders of their respective conferences. This also suggests that they are older men in years of service. Those who are beginning their ministry at a university parish have not yet earned the right to hold the honorary doctorate.

b) Pastors with some formal training: According to item 2, Table 51, there is a dearth of pastors in both groups who have had at least some formal training for student work. Only about one-quarter of the "older" men reported that they had had such instruction which

TABLE 51

RECORDS OF 31 "OLDER" AND 31 "YOUNGER" PASTORS CONTINUED

	Areas of achievement	"Older" pastors		"Younger" pastors	
		Number	Per cent	Number	Per cent
1.	Pastors who possess doctoral degree	17	54.0	2	6.5
2.	Pastors with some formal training for student work	8	26.0	3	9.7
3.	Pastors taking summer courses in student work for credit	6	19.0	0	0.0
4.	Pastors who claim direct relation between preaching and counseling	30	96.5	28	90.0
5.	Pastors with training which helps to recognize symptoms for referral	21	67.7	24	77.5
6.	Pastors who teach student classes or groups of some kind	11	35.4	11	35.4
7.	Pastors who encourage students to become church members	24	77.5	17	55.0
8.	Pastors whose youth do some lay visitation evangelism with students	26	83.7	19	61.4
9.	Number of Faculty Christian Fellowships reported by pastors	9	29.0	4	11.0
10.	Those who believe that the university parish pastor who trains and serves acceptably should expect "reasonable" security or status under the Methodist system	27	87.0	24	77.0

would help them in their ministry to students, but they outranked by three to one their juniors who counted less than ten per cent of their group among this number.

c) Pastors taking special summer courses: Demonstrating that one of the reasons why they might have been reappointed to university parish pastorates for a number of years, returns from item 2 indicate that a much higher percentage of "older" than "younger" pastors have enrolled in credit courses for the study of Methodist student work that are offered at some of the leading Methodist seminaries during the summer months. The observer must take into consideration that the men who are serving their second year at a university situation had not yet had time to schedule such a course of training. And it appears that many of the men in this category are younger pastors who would not be able to afford such training without some sort of subsidy or financial aid. But also it must be pointed out that every one of these thirty-one pastors was appointed to his post in Methodism without having received the important training in student work which such a course offers.

One wonders how much better these pastors might be performing in their ministry to student life if more of them had attended the summer courses and received the specialized training in student work. When one reasons that of the sixty-two pastors who make up both of these control-groups a total of only six pastors have received this special training, the prospects of the improved services they might be rendering if all of them had such training is something to be conjectured.

d) Relationship between preaching and counseling: Item 4 of Table 51 indicates striking uniformity between the thinking of both

groups which, for the most part, concurred that there should be a direct relationship between their preaching and the number of persons who seek them out for personal counseling. This is one of the most encouraging revelations of this portion of the study. If it is true that the function of counseling ranks as high in the ministry of the university parish pastor to students as the bulk of the pastors canvassed seem to think it does, then such judgment is corroborated by this testimony of both groups.

e) Training to help recognize symptoms for referral: Item 5 of Table 51 illustrates the superior number of "younger" pastors over "older" pastors who have had special training other than their own reading which aids them to recognize symptoms during counseling with students so that they can make professional referral. It is logical to assume that this ten per cent margin enjoyed by the juniors over their seniors in this important phase of relating to students is due to a heavier emphasis placed on counseling and clinical instruction in seminary training during the past ten years. It follows that if the "older" pastors have been preaching from fourteen to thirty-two years they have had less opportunity to receive such formal training because it was not offered while they were in seminary. And the longer one is removed from formal seminary training the less likely he is to return for it.

f) Pastors who teach: Item 6 of Table 51 indicates that the same number of pastors in each group taught some kind of a student class or group in connection with their ministry in the university community. The amazing revelation of this finding, however, is not that an identical number of pastors were performing an active teaching role, but that

two-thirds of them did not appear to be exercising their teaching prerogative (either formally or informally) at all.

Some allowance must be made here for the fact that many state laws prohibit or limit the pastor's teaching of religion on the campus of a public institution. But there is no law that restricts a pastor from teaching classes in his church. Again it must be emphasized that aside from special situations where the local pastor who is academically qualified to do so is helping to get a sound teaching program of religion established as a part of the college curriculum, the work of teaching religion on the college campus belongs to the professional teacher and not to the pastor.

g) Encouraging students to become church members: According to findings summarized in item 6 of Table 51, more than three-fourths of the more mature pastors encouraged students to become church members either in full membership or by the affiliate relationship; whereas only a little more than one-half of the junior pastors encouraged this activity. The observer is at a loss to understand the reason for the wide discrepancy between the records of the two groups in regard to this matter. Could it be that the "younger" men have not been on the field long enough to become impressed with the importance of fulfilling this phase of their evangelistic obligation to students? Or could it be that the more mature pastors have discovered through experience the wisdom of emphasizing church membership among residents of the university community? Data returned here cannot furnish a conclusive answer to either of these questions which might well be explored further in a more detailed study. Again, the provocative question might be asked, "what about the 22.5

per cent of the pastors in the "older" group and the 45 per cent of the men in the "younger" group, as illustrated in item 7 of Table 51, who professed to lay no stress on the matter of enlistment of members for the church?

h) Visitation enlistment: Despite the general impression that one gets through the observation of these data that visitation enlistment of students among students is looked upon with declining interest as a valid phase of campus evangelism, it is significant that 83.7 per cent of the "older" pastors reported that their student groups practiced this custom to some degree. According to item 8, Table 52, which indicates that only 61 per cent of the "younger" men reported groups practicing this phase of campus evangelism, it would appear that the junior pastors viewed this mode of spreading the Christian gospel among students on their campuses with a disparaging look. As much as they were in accord that modern campus evangelism needs a modern counterpart for this type of spreading the "good news," they appeared unable to name a suitable substitute.

i) Faculty Christian Fellowships: It appears, through observation of item 9 of Table 51, which summarizes data received from both groups concerning the number of Faculty Christian Fellowships reported on the sixty-two campuses covered by this cross-tabulation, that schools which are related to churches of the "older" pastors were doing more than twice as well in organizing Faculty Christian Fellowships as the schools which are served by the "younger" men. The "younger" men have not been on the field long enough to realize the importance of the presence of this Christian body on the campus. "Older" men relate to members of the

faculty more easily. It is also true that since the schools related to the churches of the "older" pastors are generally larger than the schools related to churches served by the "younger" pastors, their larger size may be a factor in inducing the need for such an organization at these institutions. This is conjecture, however, which cannot be confirmed by data returned here. Again, it should be pointed out that the 80 per cent of the pastors who reported the presence of no Faculty Christian Fellowship among these sixty-two churches might well discover the tremendous value of such an organization on their respective campuses and leave no stone unturned in helping to promote the formation of the same.

i) The expectation of "reasonable" security or status: Despite the fact that this question provoked more comment pro and con than other questions asked in the study, it is significant that most of the men in both of these groups believed that when a minister trains for a university parish pastorate and does an acceptable job, he ought to expect a "reasonable" degree of security in this type of appointment under the Methodist system. That 87 per cent of the "older" men should feel this way, as revealed in item 10 of Table 51, reflects their sincere reactions after they have held such posts for more than fourteen years. That the junior pastors would be somewhat less sure of such an opinion could easily reflect their inexperience in service at such a station. That fifty-one out of sixty-one, or 82 per cent of the pastors involved in this cross-tabulation should feel strongly enough about this matter to express themselves with conviction is not an implied affront to the Methodist appointive system, but it does betoken the keen interest of these pastors in a logical continuation of trained and experienced leadership at these strategic stations in the best interest of service to student life.

3. Analysis of Membership and Counseling Factors

Cross-tabulation of data returned in regard to five additional areas of achievement and practice on the part of the two groups of university pastors is necessary before judgments can be formed concerning their corporate performance. This material must be analyzed in relation to all the material previously presented in this chapter. The material is summarized for graphic review in Table 52.

TABLE 52

RECORDS OF 31 "OLDER" AND 31 "YOUNGER" PASTORS CONTINUED

Areas of achievement	By "older" pastors	By "younger" pastors	Comparison by percentage
1. Total number of Methodist-preference students on campus	36,955	10,667	34.5
2. Average number of Methodist preference students per campus	1,192	334	34.5
3. Average membership of related churches involved	1,650	732	44.5
4. Average number of students per church who attend the Sunday morning preaching service	203	55	27.0
5. Average number of hours per week of student-counseling by pastor	5.2	4	77.0

a) Methodist-preference students: Comparison and contrast of the performance of "older" and "younger" pastors at their respective university parishes cannot logically be undertaken without consideration of the size of the blocks of material with which the pastors have to work. Items 1 and 2 of Table 52 clearly show that the "older" pastors had more than

three times as much material with which to operate as did the "younger" men. From the predominance in size of the groups of Methodist-preference students who attend institutions related to the ministry of the "older" men (as well as from other data marshalled earlier in this chapter), we know that the schools served by the "older" pastors are larger than the schools served by the "younger" men. Also, since denominational colleges are usually smaller than the larger state and independent schools (and different in many other ways), we know that more pastors of the "older" group are related to state and independent schools than are the "younger" pastors. Therefore, the converse of the above is also true, and more of the "younger" pastors are related to the smaller denominational colleges than are the "older" pastors.

These questions now arise. "Is there a basic difference between the 'religious bent' or the 'religious quality' of the Methodist-preference student who attends the smaller denominational college and that of the student who attends the larger public or independent institution?" And if so, "How does the relation of this differential affect the work of the two types of pastors as they relate to their respective blocks of Methodist-preference students?" These matters must be taken into consideration and will be brought up in a later summary of this cross-tabulation.

b) Membership of related churches: Items 3 and 4 in Table 52 confirm our knowledge that the "older" pastors are as a rule dealing with larger numbers of students than are the "younger" pastors. Items 1 and 2 proved this to be the case with the number of Methodist-preference students registered on respective campuses of both groups, and items 3 and 4 confirm this knowledge in regard to the size of churches served by pastors involved.

Item 3 reveals that whereas there are more than three times as many Methodist-preference students on the campus of the "older" pastor, his church recorded only a little more than twice as many members as the church served by the "younger" pastor.

New factors are brought to light by this comparing and contrasting of membership figures. For example, the average church of the "older" pastor which has 1,650 members on the roll would appear to be in a much better position to employ an adequate staff, such as assistants, associates, student workers, and/or directors of Wesley groups, for oversight of student work, than the church served by the "younger" pastor with an average membership of only 732.

c) Students at preaching service: According to data summarized by item 5 of Table 52, the "younger" pastors were reaching only about one-fourth as many students through the preaching service on Sunday morning as were reached by the "older" pastors. In this respect, even though the "older" pastor had a three to one margin of students to draw from, he was still doing a better job proportionately of appealing to youth in his Sunday morning preaching service. It is logical to assume that if the "older" man has been on the job longer and has the benefit of more years of experience, he ought to be doing better work in this department of his ministry to students.

d) Hours of student counseling: The final area investigated for comparison and contrast between the performance of the "older" and "younger" pastors related to the number of hours of student counseling per week by each group. These data are summarized in item 5. Because of the nature of the matter involved and because allowances must be

made for variation in answers, figures supplied by these data should not be regarded as mathematically precise. But they represent an approximation and point in a direction which leads the observer to conlude that the "older" pastor is spending about 20 per cent more time counseling with students than the "younger" pastor. Whether he is doing a better piece of work qualitatively could not be determined here. It would be necessary to weigh the maturity and experience which the years lend to perfecting counseling techniques of the "older" pastors against the more "scientific" methods of counseling which might have been learned by the "younger" men because they received more recent clinical training in seminary.

B. Correlation of 16 Pastors With Special Training and 16 Pastors without Special Training in Student Work

In order to discover whether there is correlation between the pastoral records of men on the field who have had specialized formal training for student work at a university parish and the pastoral records of men who have not had such training, the following procedure was adopted. A search of data revealed a total of sixteen pastors who stated that they had attended one of the summer credit courses in specialized training in student work which are offered annually for university parish pastors at some of the larger Methodist seminaries. In addition to this training all but three of this group indicated that they had formal training in student work through seminary courses, periodic inter-church conferences, and/or professional experience with social service groups. They had also done extensive reading in the field of religion in higher education. The writer felt that this small

but select group should be able to demonstrate more nearly the performance of the ideal university parish pastor than any others. Jurisdictionally, this group was scattered throughout the nation like this: South Central led with six, North Central had five, Southeastern noted three, and individual pastors with such training were found in the Western area and in the Northeastern section. It is significant that 69 per cent of these men with specialized and formal training for student work reside in the central section of the United States which returned nearly 50 per cent of the instruments used in this study. It is also significant that nearly three-fourths of the men with such training are located more closely to schools where this training is provided than are the remaining one-fourth.

The second group selected for comparing and contrasting with the first group was chosen by lot from among the men in the nation who indicated that they had not attended a summer course for the training of university parish pastors in student work. An equal number of sixteen pastors was selected for the second group, only one of whom reported that he had received some degree of formal instruction during his regular seminary training. These pastors were chosen proprotionately from the respective jurisdictions as follows: three each from the Western, Northeastern, South Central and Southeastern areas. Four were chosen from the larger North Central area. The writer felt that records of these two groups should be compared and contrasted in the same areas of achievement as were investigated in section A of this chapter.

1. Analysis of Specialized Training as Related to Students Reached and Membership Records

This portion of the study was broken down into two parts which

deal with (1) the number of Methodist-preference students reached by the ministry of both groups, and (2) the comparative number of students who are recorded on the rolls as members of the church. The analysis of these data is facilitated by a summary presented in Table 53.

TABLE 53

NUMBER OF STUDENTS REACHED BY 16 PASTORS WITH AND WITHOUT SPECIALIZED TRAINING FOR STUDENT WORK

	Areas of achievement	With training for student work		Without training for student work	
		Number	Per cent	Number	Per cent
1.	Students reached vitally	2,212	22.2	748	18.8
2.	Average per church reached vitally	138	22.2	47	18.8
3.	Students reached casually	3,440	34.6	1,105	27.2
4.	Average per church reached casually	215	34.6	69	27.2
5.	Total students reached	5,652	56.6	1,853	46.4
6.	Average per church of total reached	353	56.6	116	46.6
7.	Full members enrolled in church	414	2.2	92	.9
8.	Average number of full members enrolled per church	26	2.2	6	.9
9.	Affiliate members enrolled	810	7.9	101	2.7
10.	Average number of affiliate members per church	50	7.9	6	2.7
11.	Total both kinds of members	1,224	12.4	191	4.8
12.	Average both kinds of members per church	77	12.4	12	4.8

a) Students reached vitally and casually: As illustrated by item 1 in Table 53, approximately three times as many students are reached by the "trained" pastors as by those without training. Making allowance for the fact that pastors without training in student work have only 38 per cent as many Methodist-preference students on their respective campuses from which to draw[1] as do pastors who have special training, the latter are still doing a better job with what they have to work than are the former.

According to item 3, pastors with training in student work are casually reaching superior numbers over pastors without training in about the same proportion that they excel in vitally reaching students. Approximately the same advantage in percentage is enjoyed by "trained" pastors over "untrained" pastors when the total numbers of both vitally and casually reached groups are tabulated. The advantage enjoyed by pastors with training over those without training is further pointed up when their records are compared with the nationwide norm established by the typical pastor. Pastors with training in student work reach 138 students vitally on the average with their ministry, whereas the national norm is 87.8. On the other hand, pastors without such training reach only 53.5 per cent of the national norm.

b) Students enrolled as members: If enrollment of students as church members is one test of the effectiveness of a university parish pastor's relationship with students, then it is plainly visible, according to items 7-12 in Table 53, that not only are "trained" pastors doing a better job numerically, but they are also outstripping the "untrained" men on a percentage basis. The writer felt that it was necessary to

---

[1] Above, p. 427.

include both full and affiliate members in this inquiry, since data reveal that in certain sections of the country some pastors leaned toward one type of membership-emphasis among students to the exclusion of another. When the membership records of pastors with and without training in student work are compared with the membership records of the typical pastor, the following becomes clear. Pastors with training enrolled a total of seventy-seven students as church members in both full and affiliate relationships, as against the average enrollment of forty-nine members by the typical pastor. And Table 53 indicates that the pastor without training enrolled an average of twelve students in both categories, as compared with the national norm of forty-nine. The latter is less than a 25 per cent performance.

While it is necessary to take into consideration the fact that there are some Methodist student "church" groups at university centers which operate as "Foundation Churches" and do not keep a roll of members nor urge students to join their organizations in the same way that the typical Methodist church seeks to enlist members--at the same time, the facts presented by Table 53 cannot be ignored. That the pastors who are trained in student work should be enlisting more than six times as many members as the untrained men on a numerical basis, and that they should be enrolling three times as many on a percentage basis present a definite case for trained leadership at our university churches.

2. Analysis of Additional Areas of Achievement

The comparing and contrasting of the records of additional areas of achievement by sixteen pastors with and without specialized training in student work is summarized in Table 54. An analysis of the ten additional areas of achievement follows:

TABLE 54

RECORDS OF 16 PASTORS WITH AND WITHOUT SPECIALIZED TRAINING IN STUDENT WORK, CONTINUED

Areas of achievement	With training for student work		Without training for student work	
	Number	Per cent	Number	Per cent
1. Pastors with doctoral degree	3	18.8	1	6.3
2. Pastors with some formal training for student work	13	87.0	1	6.3
3. Pastors taking summer courses in student work for credit	16	100.0	0	0.0
4. Pastors who claim direct relation between preaching and counseling	15	94.0	14	88.0
5. Pastors with training which helps to recognize symptoms for referral	13	81.0	13	81.0
6. Pastors who teach student classes or groups of some kind	6	37.4	5	31.2
7. Pastors who encourage students to become church members	13	81.0	12	75.0
8. Pastors whose youth do some lay-visitation evangelism with students	11	68.5	10	62.5
9. Number of Faculty Christian Fellowships reported by pastors	7	43.8	1	6.3
10. Those who believe that the university parish pastor who trains and serves acceptably should expect "reasonable" security or status under the Methodist system	14	87.5	12	75.0

a) Academic degrees and formal training: Data returned in support of item 1, Table 54, recorded no doctoral degrees on the earned academic level held by pastors in either category. The three doctoral degrees held by men with training and the single doctorate possessed by men without training were all honorary Doctor of Divinity degrees. Items 2 and 3 have already been noted regarding the amount of formal and specialized training in student work taken by pastors in both categories.

b) Areas of additional achievement: There was little variation in the records of both types of pastors revealed by item 4 of Table 54, wherein both groups indicated a substantial majority who have discovered that there is direct relationship between their preaching and counseling. That this relationship is a matter of degree, however, is revealed by their declaration of the quantity of relationship which they felt is present. There were three pastors with training in student work who felt that considerable relationship existed, and only one without training who felt that there was considerable correlation. On the other hand, 75 per cent of the "trained" pastors who felt that there was relationship between counseling and preaching thought that there was only some relationship instead of considerable relationship; whereas thirteen of the pastors without training said that there was only some relationship instead of considerable relationship. One pastor with training said that there was no relationship, and two pastors without training said the same.

According to item 5 of the same table, it is significant that both groups recorded 81 per cent of their number as having had some kind

of specialized training which helps them to recognize symptoms indicating a need for professional referral of emotional problems which are common to college students. The chief variation in data returned here was the revelation that six of the pastors with training in student work had considerable training in this area, whereas only one of the second group professed considerable background. Seven of the pastors with specialized instruction had some clinical training in this area, whereas twelve of the latter group had received some clinical instruction. There were three pastors in each group who admitted that they had no clinical training.

According to item 6, pastors of respective groups who teach student classes or groups of some kind were nearly on a par, with the first group surpassing the second group by only one pastor or 6.2 per cent. Item 7 illustrates that a comparable majority of pastors in both groups encouraged students to become members of their respective churches. The variation here was found to be one of degree; namely, ten of the pastors with training in student work felt that they had some obligation to urge enrollment of student members, whereas there were eight pastors of the second category who felt some obligation. Three of the "trained" pastors thought that they had no responsibility to urge student memberships, and four of the "untrained" pastors felt the same way.

A review of data returned regarding item 8, Table 54, indicates that about three-fourths of both groups reported that their groups do some visitation membership enlistment by students among students. Six pastors with training reported student groups who used no visitation enlistment techniques, and six of the "untrained" pastors states that their youth did not practice this phase of campus evangelism. The national norm of pastors reporting student groups who use some form of visitation

membership enlistment has been established 71.4 per cent.

A pronounced variation was noted between pastors of the two groups in reporting the presence of Faculty Christian Fellowships on their respective campuses, with the "trained" men reporting seven such fellowships for a percentage of 43.8 as against the record of the "untrained" men who counted only a single fellowship for a percentage of 6.3. This variation shows up equally clear when percentages reported by the "trained" and the "untrained" group are compared to the nation-wide norm which has been established at 19 per cent.[1] In other words, "trained" pastors report nearly three times as many Faculty Christian Fellowships as the typical pastor, whereas "untrained" pastors report a little more than one-third as many of such organizations in comparison to the national norm.

Item 10 of table 54 indicates that a large majority of both the "trained" and the "untrained" men believed that the university parish pastor who trains and serves acceptably should expect "reasonable" security or status under the Methodist system.

3. Analysis of Membership and Counseling Factors

Examination of cross-tabulated data in regard to five additional areas which concern membership statistics and records of student counseling is facilitated by summarized statements in Table 55. Results of these cross-tabulations are presented herewith:

---

[1] Above, p. 204.

TABLE 55

RECORDS OF 16 PASTORS WITH AND WITHOUT SPECIALIZED TRAINING IN STUDENT WORK, CONTINUED

Areas of achievement	Pastors with training	Pastors without training	Comparison by percentage
1. Total number of Methodist-preference students on campuses	9,959	3,908	40.2
2. Average number of Methodist-preference students per campus	622	250	40.2
3. Average membership of related churches involved	1,178	684	58.0
4. Average number of students per church who attend the Sunday morning preaching service	125	44	25.2
5. Average number of hours per week of student-counseling by pastor	2.7	1.7	62.8

a) Number of Methodist-preference students: Items 1 and 2 of Table 55 indicate that the "trained" pastors had between two and three times as many Methodist-preference students enrolled on the campuses of their respective related schools as the "untrained" pastors had at their schools. This indicates that the schools adjacent to churches administered by the "trained" pastors are larger than the schools adjacent to churches administered by the "untrained" pastors. Consequently, the "trained" pastors bear a higher percentage of responsibility for involving students in their local church programs. It might be inferred that one of the reasons why pastors with training in student work are entrusted with pulpits near the larger schools is because they are better equipped to handle these larger assignments than are pastors without training. Data assembled here do not conclusively bear out such a judgment, however.

b) Membership of churches and student attendance: The above inference picks up considerable justification in light of data returned in item 3, Table 55, which show that the average membership of the near-campus church administered by the "trained" pastor is nearly twice as large as that of the church served by the "untrained pastor." The "trained" pastor had 200 more members in his church than were enrolled in the average college church across the nation, and the "untrained" pastor had nearly 300 members less than the average. In justice to the smaller number recorded by the "untrained" pastor, however, it is to be reasoned that with only 40 per cent as much material available with which to do his work it would be expected that he might preach to a proportionately smaller group on Sunday morning. According to item 4 of the same table, however, the "untrained" pastor preaches to about one-third of the number of students in his Sunday morning congregation as does the "trained" pastor. Since it has been discovered that the average university parish pastor preaches to 121 students on Sunday morning, these figures show that the "trained" pastor speaks to a sizeable percentage above the average, whereas the "untrained" pastor preaches on any given Sunday morning to only 45 per cent of the average. The assumption might be inferred here, then, that with more training the pastors of the second category might do a better job with the material they have. This assumption could hardly be defended, however, because if the "untrained" pastor has one-third as many students in his Sunday morning congregation and maintains this record with only 40 per cent of the material with which the "trained" pastor has to work, it would appear that on a percentage basis that both pastors were doing about equally well.

c) Hours of student counseling: Item 5 of Table 55 reveals that the "untrained" pastor reported less than two-thirds as many hours per week spent in counseling with students as were reported by "trained" pastors. This variation is not significant when one considers that neither pastor reports many hours in this activity. It is possible that the "untrained" pastor does not know how to make himself available to students for counseling; and, again, it is possible that the larger church served by the "trained" pastor either allows the pastor to turn over a bulk of his counseling to staff assistants or demands so much more time in added administrative duties that the total number of hours he spends in counseling with students is not appreciably greater than the total that is reported by the "untrained" men.

C. Correlation of 22 Pastors Who Teach and 22 Pastors Who Do Not Teach College Credit Courses

A third area of cross-tabulation which promised fruitful results was the comparison of the records of pastors who teach college courses in religion for academic credit with the records of pastors who do not teach such courses. A search revealed that twenty-two pastors taught such courses. They were distributed as follows: four in the Western Jurisdiction, one in North Central, one in Northeastern, nine in South Central, and seven in Southeastern. It is significant that 73 per cent of these men were located in the Southern section of the nation.

An equal number of pastors who do not teach were chosen by lot, according to the same distribution by jurisdictions. The writer felt that this was a fairer way to choose the second group, inasmuch as so many of the first group were located in the two Southern areas. The

records of the two groups of pastors were then compared as to (1) the percentage of students reached by the local pastor, (2) the percentage of student-members enrolled in the local church, and (3) the percentage of students who attend the Sunday morning preaching service. These data are summarized in Table 56.

TABLE 56

COMPARISON OF RECORDS OF 22 PASTORS WHO TEACH COLLEGE CREDIT COURSES WITH RECORDS OF PASTORS WHO DO NOT TEACH

Statistics and areas of achievement	Pastors who teach	Pastors who don't teach	Comparison by percentage [a]
1. Average number of Methodist-preference students per campus	506	242	47.8
2. Average number of students per church reached vitally	89	31	34.8
3. Average number of students per church reached casually	109	49	45.0
4. Total number of students per church reached	198	74	37.2
5. Average number of students enrolled in full membership	16	10	62.5
6. Average number of students enrolled in affiliate membership	49	10	24.0
7. Total average of both kinds of members enrolled per church	65	20	30.8
8. Average number of students per church who attend the Sunday morning preaching service	76	46	60.5

[a]This column of figures represents the result of figures in column one divided by figures in column two--as expressed in percentages. This is an "arbitrary" but clarifying method of "measuring" one phase of observable behaviour against another to determine the performance of pastors who teach as against the performance of pastors who do not teach.

1. Number of Students Reached

According to item 1 of Table 56, the number of Methodist-preference students on the respective campuses of the pastors who do not teach courses for college credit is less than half the number of students of the same category who attend colleges where pastors do teach credit courses. At this juncture it is pertinent to point out that both of these figures are smaller than the average number of Methodist-preference students who frequent the campuses of schools covered by this study. In Chapter IX this number was found to be 580. It is logical to assume that both of these figures are smaller than the national average because most of them represent pastors who live in the South, where smaller colleges and universities predominate and where legal restrictions are less limiting. If this study were carried further it would probably reveal that not only are the schools which are related to the pastors in this section of the study smaller than the national average, but their churches, as well, are smaller in size than the average college church of 975 members.

From a study of item 2 of Table 56, it is observed that even though pastors who do not teach credit courses have less than one-half the number of Methodist-preference students on their respective campuses, they are doing only about one-third as well in relating to students vitally as those who do teach credit courses. Those who don't teach these courses do a little better when it comes to reaching students casually, as seen in item 3 of the same table; but the real test is observed in a comparison of the total number of students reached, both vitally and casually. Here the "teaching" pastor reaches nearly three times as many students as the pastor who doesn't teach credit courses.

Taking into consideration the number of Methodist-preference students on campuses of both groups, these figures indicate a respectable advantage enjoyed by group one over group two; which might or might not be correlated with the fact that pastors in group one more frequently have fundamental and personal relations with a larger number of students than do pastors who do not teach courses for credit. The fact that the total number of students who are reached by both groups is less by a 20 per cent margin than the national average of 240 students per church might be due to the smaller size of Southern colleges, which predominate in this cross-tabulation.

2. Number of Students Enrolled as Members

If a second test of the effectiveness of a university parish pastor's relationship with students is measured by the number of students who are enrolled as members of the local parish church, a comparison of the membership records of "teaching" and "non-teaching" pastors is in order. Such a comparison is noted in items 5-7 of Table 56. Because students are enrolled as full members in some churches, as affiliate members in other churches, and as both full and affiliate members in still other churches, it was necessary to tabulate student memberships of both kinds.

It is observed in item 5 that the average number of students who are enrolled as full members on the rolls of pastors who "teach" is about the same as the 15.5 figure found to be the national norm for all pastors covered in this study. The average number of full members recorded by "non-teaching" pastors shows a healthier relationship in comparison to the records of "teaching" pastors than it does in the

affiliate member category. According to item 6, "non-teaching" pastors enroll only one-quarter as many affiliate members as do "teaching" pastors; whereas their respective Methodist-preference student pools are half as large.

However, because some Southern churches use the full membership classification to the exclusion of the affiliate member relationship, it is only fair to reserve judgment until a comparison of totals of both kinds of members is visualized. This is accomplished in item 7, which reveals that "non-teaching" pastors enroll fewer than one-third as many members of both categories as "teaching" pastors enroll. Here again is a suggestion that the pastor who teaches credit courses or who is qualified to teach them is in a better position to relate to students than the pastor who does not "teach."

3. Students Attending Sunday Morning Worship

Observation of item 8, Table 56, reveals that even though the "non-teaching" pastor does not number as many students in his congregation on any given Sunday morning as does the "teaching" pastor, when relative sizes of the Methodist-preference student pools are weighed he appears to be holding his own. It is pertinent to perceive, however, that neither the "teaching" nor the "non-teaching" pastor comes up to the average of 121 students which are found in the church of the typical university parish pastor on any given Sunday morning.

Cross-tabulation having produced significant information in three areas of correlation, a fourth area of cross-tabulations will be investigated next.

D. Correlation of 21 Pastors Whose Students Do Considerable Visitation Enlistment and 21 Pastors Whose Students Do No Visitation Enlistment

A total of twenty-one pastors across the nation reported that their student groups practiced considerable visitation membership enlistment among fellow students. They were distributed among the jurisdictions as follows: two in the Western area, four in North Central, five in Northeastern, three in South Central, and seven in the Southeastern Jurisdiction. It is noted that this distribution is somewhat more uniform than the distribution of pastors who teach college credit courses; however, it is significant that five of these pastors were located in the Northeast, which we have found to be rather luke-warm in Methodist student work. The largest number of these pastors whose student groups do considerable visitation enlistment were found in the Southeast.

An equal number of pastors who stated that their student groups carry on no visitation enlistment among their fellows was chosen by lot to form a second group. They were selected according to the same jurisdictional distribution as were the first group. Records of the two groups of pastors were then compared as to (1) the percentage of students reached by the local pastor, (2) the percentage of student-members enrolled in the local church, and (3) the percentage of students who attend the Sunday morning preaching service. These data are summarized in Table 57.

TABLE 57

COMPARISON OF RECORDS OF 21 PASTORS WHOSE STUDENTS DO CONSIDERABLE AND NO VISITATION MEMBERSHIP ENLISTMENT

Statistics and areas of achievement	Considerable enlistment	No enlistment visitation	Comparison by percentage
1. Average number of Methodist-preference students per campus	717	321	44.8
2. Average number of students per church reached vitally	206	33	16.0
3. Average number of students per church reached casually	228	86	37.5
4. Total number of students per church reached	434	119	27.4
5. Average number of students enrolled in full membership	29	9	31.0
6. Average number of students enrolled in affiliate membership	49	10	20.4
7. Total average of both kinds of members enrolled per church	78	19	24.5
8. Average number of students per church who attend the Sunday morning preaching service	212	40	18.9

1. Number of Students Reached

Item 1 in Table 57 indicates that the size of the Methodist-preference groups on campuses where students carried on no organized plan of visitation enlistment among their fellows was less than one-half as large as the size of similar bodies on campuses where this phase of visitation evangelism was practiced. This indicates that colleges in this study where this program was not carried on are smaller than colleges in this study where such a program was practiced. Suitable allowances must be made for this factor in comparing and contrasting records of the two groups of pastors.

According to items 2 and 3 of this same table, it will be observed that pastors whose groups did no visitation enlistment were doing a poorer job of reaching students both vitally and casually than pastors whose students practiced this technique of campus evangelism. Pastors of the first category were doing less than a five to one job of reaching students vitally, and they were accomplishing only a little more than a one to three performance in reaching them casually. Considering the total of both kinds of relationships, the second group was turning in only a little better than a one-quarter performance, in comparison to the performance of the first group. Even when suitable allowances are made for the difference in the size of respective Methodist-preference student pools, an appreciable distinction between the records of the two groups of pastors is perceived.

The superiority of the student work of pastors whose students did considerable visitation enlistment shows up even more when their records are compared with the records of the typical pastor. For example, the pastors whose students did considerable visitation enlistment reported

a pool of Methodist-preference students that was 23 per cent larger than the 580 Methodist-preference students who were found in the parish of the typical pastor. He reached nearly two and one-half times as many students vitally as did the typical pastor. The 228 students whom he reached casually was an appreciably larger number than the 153 students who were reached in the same manner by the typical pastor; and the total number of students he reached was nearly double the national norm of 240 students who were reached by the typical pastor. The apparent inferiority of the work of the pastors whose students did no visitation enlistment shows up equally clearly when compared with the record of the typical pastor.[1]

Of course this area of investigation is too involved with other implications and ramifications to suggest that the use of visitation enlistment is the only reason why records of one group of pastors overshadow records of another group of pastors. These data do not conclusively stand up as the one and only justification for concluding why the work of certain pastors was superior to the work of other pastors, but they do point in the direction of such an assumption. Observation of these figures by pastors whose student groups do no visitation enlistment might well lead to a re-examination of the possibilities of this form of campus evangelism.

2. Number of Students Enrolled

According to items 5, 6, and 7 of Table 57, pastors whose students did no visitation enlistment were doing a much poorer job of enrolling students as members of their parish churches, in comparison to the records turned in by pastors whose students practiced such a form of campus

---

[1] Above, p. 355.

evangelism. It appears that the former group was doing less than one-third as well in reaching students for full membership, and it was doing only one-fifth as well in enrolling students in the affiliate relationship. In the enrollment of both full and affiliate members the former group was doing only one-quarter as well. Making allowances for the difference in the size of the blocks of the Methodist-preference material that is available to both groups, the variation in records is still great.

If the enlistment of members is any criterion for the judgment of successful student work by a pastor at a university parish, these figures would seem to weight the scales towards his encouragement of visitation enlistment of students among their fellows.

3. Students Attending Sunday Morning Worship

It is an accepted fact that increased visitation among the members of the parish of the normal Methodist church bears fruit in a perceptable increase in the size of the congregation at the Sunday morning worship hour. That there is a direct relationship between the amount of calling which a pastor does and the number of communicants who come to hear him preach, as well as the regularity of their worship, is not to be denied. This holds true as a result of any planned visitation program on the part of laymen of the church and/or students of the local church student work program.

That this same principle might be operable when applied to campus evangelism is strongly suspected when one observes the findings in item 8 of Table 56. The average number of students attending churches where visitation enlistment was carried on among students was five times

greater than it was in churches which make a point of practicing no visitation enlistment among students. Student attendance was also 75 per cent greater than it was at the church of the typical pastor.[1] And measuring in the same manner, the pastor whose students did no visiting assembled only one-third of the typical pastor's "student congregation" during his Sunday morning preaching hour.[2]

E. Correlation of 16 Pastors Whose Churches Have Campus-Church Relations Committees and 16 Pastors Whose Churches Do Not Have the Committees

A final area of investigation wherein the writer thought that cross-tabulation might reveal additional material profitable to this study is the relationship of records and achievements of pastors whose parish churches have the disciplinary Campus-Church Relations Committee to facilitate student relations with the records and achievements of pastors whose parish churches do not have such a committee.

Following a listing of all churches reporting the organization of a Campus-Church Relations Committee, a total of sixteen churches with such committees were chosen by lot to form one group for use in the cross-tabulation. Three churches were then selected from each of the jurisdictions across the nation with the exception of the North Central area, from which four churches were chosen. Pastoral records of achievement at these churches were tabulated according to (1) the percentage of students reached by the local pastor, (2) the percentage of student-members enrolled in the local church, and (3) the percentage of students who attend the Sunday morning preaching service.

---

[1] Ibid.

[2] Ibid.

In order to form a second group to complete the cross-tabulation, all of the churches included in this survey which reported no Campus-Church Relations Committee were listed. From this list an equal number of sixteen churches was chosen by lot in the same proportion among the jurisdictions as were chosen in group one. Pastoral records of achievement at these churches were tabulated similarly to the summary of records that were noted for group one. The records of the two groups were then compared and contrasted and the results of this cross-tabulation were summarized in Table 58.

TABLE 58

COMPARISON OF RECORDS OF PASTORS 16 WITH AND WITHOUT CAMPUS-CHURCH RELATIONS COMMITTEES

Statistics and areas of achievement	Pastors with committee	Pastors without committee	Comparison by percentage
1. Average number of Methodist-preference students per campus	962	212	22.0
2. Average number of students per church reached vitally	188	27	14.3
3. Average number of students per church reached casually	262	42	16.1
4. Total number of students per church reached	450	69	15.3
5. Average number of students enrolled in full membership	27	9	33.3
6. Average number of students enrolled in affiliate membership	25	1.5	6.0
7. Average number of both kinds of members enrolled per church	52	10.5	20.2
8. Average number of students per church who attend the Sunday morning preaching service	186	37	19.8

1. Number of Students Reached

According to item 1 in Table 58, it would appear that Methodist-preference student groups whose churches do not have a Campus-Church Relations Committee are about one-fifth the size of the same groups at campuses near Methodist churches which do report such an organization. It is observed that the number of Methodist-preference students in group one exceeded the number of these students who are found on the campus of the typical pastor by a 65 per cent margin, which is a sizable variation; whereas the number of Methodist-preference students who are found in the second group was only 38 per cent as large as the 580 Methodist-preference students who are found on the campus of the typical pastor. Necessary allowances must be made for this difference when analyzing the results of this cross-tabulation.

Observation of item 2 of the same table reveals that even though the pool of Methodist students in group two was only one-fifth the size of the pool in group one, pastors without the committee reached only one-seventh as many students vitally as were reached by pastors with committees. And since the average number of students reached vitally by the typical pastor was 87.8,[1] it is readily discernable that pastors in the first group were doing twice as good work in reaching students in this way as the typical pastor; whereas the pastors in the second group were reaching less than one-third of the number of students who were reached by the typical pastor.

Scarcely better is the accomplishment of the pastors in group two in reaching students casually. A review of item 2 shows that pastors

[1] Above, p. 215.

in group one exceeded the record of the typical pastor in the number of students reached casually by 67 per cent, but that the percentage of students who were reached in the same fashion by pastors in group two was only two per cent better than the number of students who were reached by the same group vitally. And group two made no better showing when both "vitally" and "casually" categories were related to the showing of the same categories which were tabulated for group one. In such a correlation, according to item 4, pastors with committees reached a total of nearly twice as many students as were reached by the typical pastor; whereas the typical pastor reached a total of three and one-half times as many students as the pastor who had no committee to aid him.[1]

2. Number of Students Enrolled as Members

Observation of item 5 in Table 58 shows that pastors who do not have Campus-Church Relations Committees reported only one-third as many students enrolled in the church on the full-membership list as were reported by pastors who did have committees. Again, it will be observed that the pastor who had the committee exceeded the record of full members which was posted by the typical pastor by 77 per cent, whereas the pastor with no committee was doing only a little better than half as well as the typical pastor in the matter of enrolling full members from the student group.

The accomplishment of the pastor without a committee broke down almost completely in item 8 of the same table, where he appears to enroll only six per cent of the number of affiliate members as are registered by the pastor with a committee. It is significant that all of the affiliate members who were reported by the second group were tabulated

[1] Above, p. 215.

by two of the sixteen pastors. In other words, fourteen of the sixteen pastors reporting in the "no committee" category reported that they had no members on their church rolls in the affiliate relationship; whereas only two of the pastors who have the committee reported that they had no members by affiliation.

According to item 7 of Table 58, group two had a better showing when both kinds of student-memberships were totaled; but still the pastors who have no committees turned in only a 20 per cent score in relation to the pastors who had the committee. It is significant that the total average of both kinds of members enrolled by the typical pastor was 49.5, which was slightly exceeded by pastors in group one; but, again, it is observed that pastors without the committee were doing only one-fifth as good work in this regard as was reported by the typical pastor.

3. Students Attending Sunday Morning Worship

Treatment of cross-tabulated data will be concluded by analyzing the number of students who attended the Sunday morning preaching service of both groups of pastors. If this attendance figure offers any criterion for judgment of the effectiveness of the university parish pastor as he relates to students, then it would appear that there is definite correlation between the number of students who hear him preach on Sunday morning and the fact that he does or he does not have a Campus-Church Relations Committee to assist him in his student-relations.

According to figures tabulated in item 8 of Table 58, the pastor who had the committee preached to 186 students on any given Sunday morning, which is 53 per cent more than attended the Sunday morning worship period conducted by the typical pastor. On the other hand, the pastor who did not

have the committee preached to only thirty-seven students on any given Sunday morning, which is less than one-third the size of the student-group numbered among the congregation of the typical pastor.

Although cross-tabulation could be carried out in additional areas which might add valuable information to this study, it is felt that the most meaningful and productive areas have been sufficiently explored to bring this portion of the study to a close. The remaining section of this chapter will, therefore, be devoted to a summary and some concluding remarks regarding the five areas of cross-tabulation examined in chapter XVI.

C. Summary of Cross Tabulations

In Chapter XVI an attempt has been made to add information to our study through the cross-tabulation of data in five specific areas of investigation. Through this cross-tabulation some new knowledge has been gained. It is significant that every area of correlation explored yielded helpful information, although there was variation noted in the degree and quality of the new findings. When data from the cross-tabulations are viewed corporately and in relation to one another, their contribution to this study becomes more valuable. A brief summation of these findings is reviewed as follows:

1. Summary of the First Cross-Tabulation

Correlation of the records of thirty-one "older" pastors who had served for a number of years at university parish churches with the records of a similar number of "younger" pastors who are serving their first years at such stations reveals that the "older" pastors were reaching and enrolling more than three times as many students from their respective Methodist-preference pools of students than the "younger"

pastors who were just beginning their years of service at a university parish post. But the gap between the records of both groups of pastors is noticeably closed when one takes into consideration the larger number of students with whom the "older" pastors have to work.

Differences between the records of the "older" men and the "younger" pastors were more definitely marked upon analysis of additional areas of achievement. For example, the "older" pastors far exceeded their juniors in the number of doctoral degrees held; and "older" pastors numbered nearly three times as many who possessed formal training in student work and six times as many who had taken summer courses in student work for credit. There was a higher percentage of "older" pastors whose students did visitation membership enlistment on the campus, and the "older" men reported more than twice as many Faculty Christian Fellowships as were noted by the "younger" men.

Areas in which the "younger" pastors matched or exceeded the records of the "older" pastors were in relating to more students and enrolling more students on a percentage basis (taking into consideration the smaller number of Methodist-preference students with whom they had to work); in the realm of teaching some kind of student group; and in possessing more special training which helps them to recognize the symptoms of emotional disturbances of students for the purpose of referral. Nearly twice as many "younger" pastors felt that the university parish pastor who trains for student work and who serves acceptably should expect "reasonable" security when subject to re-appointment under the Methodist system.

Considerable value can be attached to the performance of pastors at a university church who have had some years of experience and training in student work. Both the "older" and the "younger" pastors come up short of the performance of the ideal pastor. With the exception of some areas in which both "older" and "younger" pastors could be doing better, the surprising revelation of this correlation is not that they are doing so poorly, but that they are doing so well, considering the material with which they have to work.

2. Summary of the Second Cross-Tabulation

Correlation between the records of sixteen pastors who had specialized training in Methodist student work and the records of sixteen other pastors selected by lot who professed no training in student work revealed a greater degree of similarity and difference than was revealed in the first correlation. Even though the pastor "with training" had a lower supply of student-material to draw upon, he still scored a better percentage record in reaching and enrolling students than was recorded by the "untrained" pastor. "Trained" pastors held three times the number of doctoral degrees and reported seven times as many Faculty Christian Fellowships on their respective campuses than were reported by "untrained" pastors. "Trained" pastors outscored "untrained" men in the number of hours of counseling spent per week with students by a ratio of three to two.

There was similarity in the scoring of both groups in some areas. There was agreement that there is an important relationship between the preaching and counseling functions. Eighty-one per cent of both groups possessed training which helps to recognize emotional symptoms of students

for professional referral. About one-third of each group taught a student class or group of some kind. About an equal number of pastors had students in their groups who did some visitation enlistment of members among their fellow students. There was practically unanimous agreement in the belief that pastors who secure special training for their jobs and serve acceptably, should expect a "reasonable" degree of security.

In retrospect of the findings of this correlation, the assumption can be made that the performance of the "trained" pastor at a university parish post is superior to the performance of the "untrained" pastor. And in the light of this assumption the writer feels that "training" should be made available to the pastors who are now serving university parish churches who do not now have it, and that serious consideration should be given to "training" all men who may be considered for appointment to such a station.

3. Summary of the Third Cross-Tabulation

There was less variation revealed between the performance of the 22 pastors who taught college courses for credit and the performance of those who did not teach such courses, but there is considerable value in learning how the records of both of these groups of pastors compare and contrast in light of the total study. Pastors who didn't teach credit courses had a Methodist-preference pool of students on their respective campuses which was less than one-half the size of the Methodist-preference group of students on the campuses of pastors who "teach," yet they reached only a little more than one-third (37.2 per cent) as many students as pastors who "teach."

"Teaching" pastors enlisted three times as many students on the roll of the parish church in all categories as against the number of

students enlisted by the "non-teaching" pastor. The similarities and differences pointed out in this correlation do not necessarily stand as indicative of the capabilities of the total number of pastors who are qualified to teach credit courses on the college level, but who reside in states or are adjacent to institutions where because of strict interpretations of the law or other limiting restrictions they are prohibited from teaching such classes. For example, it was discovered that there is more freedom to teach credit courses in the South than anywhere else in the nation.

4. Summary of the Fourth Cross-Tabulation

In summary of the correlation between the records of twenty-one pastors whose students did considerable visitation enlistment of members and the records of the same number of pastors whose students did not participate in this phase of campus evangelism, the writer discovered a considerable degree of variation in records. Whereas the pastors whose students did not practice visitation enlistment had only one-half as many students in their Methodist-preference pools as did pastors whose students practiced this form of campus evangelism, they reached only a little more than one-quarter of these students in all categories as were reached by pastors whose student groups practice considerable visitation enlistment. Also, the former group was able to enlist four times as many members in all categories on the church roll as were enlisted by the latter group. Five times as many students were found in the Sunday morning congregations of pastors whose students practiced some form of visitation enlistment as were reported on Sunday morning in the pews of pastors who did not practice this type of campus evangelism.

It would seem that these findings furnish two significant answers to the number one question propounded by the writer, "How can I serve students better?"; namely, (1) that no matter the prevailing opinion concerning the practice of this phase of campus evangelism, in the churches observed in this survey where the custom is practiced considerably it works; and (2) that all those who are connected in any way with the Methodist Student Movement would do well to re-examine and re-evaluate the inherent possibilities of this form of student-witnessing with a view to the revamping of its format to suit the needs of the contemporary campus.

5. Summary of the Fifth Cross-Tabulation

A summary of the final area of cross-tabulation revealed that although pastors of sixteen churches across the nation whose students did not report the organization of the disciplinary Campus-Church Relations Committee had only one-fifth as many students in their Methodist-preference pools as were reported by pastors of sixteen churches across the nation which did have such committees, they reached only 15 per cent as many students vitally and casually. Also, the total number of students who are enrolled as members of the local church by pastors without committees was appreciably lower than the percentage of students who are enrolled by pastors whose churches did have the committee.

This cross-tabulation discloses that 53 per cent more students attended the Sunday morning worship service at the church which had the committee than were in attendance on Sunday mornings at the church of the typical pastor, whereas only 33 per cent of the number of students who were present for preaching at the church of the typical pastor on any given Sunday morning were present in churches which reported no committee.

A final summation of this section of the findings leads to the observation that each of the cross-tabulations has contributed information to the study. Some parts of this information have proved to be more valuable than others and there is seen to be much variation. The writer would like to reserve final judgment about the correlations until later in the dissertation, when he has had more opportunity to weigh their findings in relation to the thrust of the entire study. It is possible that when the findings of these five cross-tabulations are viewed not only in relation to one another but corporately they may provide a mass of knowledge which adds to the learning potential of the study.

The writer will proceed now with some final conclusions in light of the total study.

PART III

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

CHAPTER XVII

GENERAL SUMMARY AND CONCLUDING OBSERVATIONS

In this chapter the writer will present a general summary of the study. He will also compare and contrast the performance of the typical pastor with the performance of the ideal pastor. The chapter will close with a conclusion regarding the validity of the hypothesis and a second conclusion concerning the cross-tabulations.

A. General Summary

This section of the chapter will be devoted to a review of background material pertinent to the study, a summary of the procedure followed, and a resumé of the performance of the typical pastor.

1. Review of Background Material

The writer began Part I of the dissertation with a statement of the problem and an outline of the projection of the study. In the opening chapter he presented the hypothesis of the dissertation and explained the method of procedure that would be followed. Chapters II, III, IV, V and VI dealt with background material which the writer thought was essential to a basic understanding of the study.

In Chapter II the writer attempted to explain the dilemma in which contemporary education finds itself caught between two opposing concepts of American higher education. Here the writer described a search that has been going on for some agent which would act as an integrating factor to cement together the multiplicity of areas of

higher learning into a unity which represents a common discipline and gives meaning to all of life as well as to the life of the university community. How a new understanding of religion could become an integrating factor uniting the various disciplines and solving the dilemma of "the crisis at the university" was explained.

Chapter III provided a description of the contemporary college student and his search for meaning in life, in contrast to a description of his predecessors of previous generations on the campus. The "dual" nature of the present day college student was discussed and the two opposing philosophies which clamor for the loyalty of student life were outlined.

In Chapter IV the writer explained how The Methodist Church has followed its students to the campus as the natural end of a chain of developments which have their origin in history. The history of American Methodist higher education, the rise of the Student Christian Movement, the evolution of the Foundations, and the story of the Methodist Student Movement were reviewed. How the quadrennial emphasis of the General Conference of 1956 and actions of the General Conference of 1960 on higher education gear into "pinpointing" the place of the university parish pastor as the key person to implement the cause of Christian higher education among Methodist students and their companions on the campus was narrated.

Chapters V and VI dealt with the projection of the qualifications and functions of the prototype of an ideal or model university parish pastor which could be used as a standard against which to measure the performance of the typical contemporary university parish pastor who labors on the field.

2. Review of Procedure and Analysis

Part II of the dissertation was devoted to a presentation and analysis of returns from the instrument which was employed to secure a bulk of the data used in the study. The instrument for study was a comprehensive list of questions divided into seven pages. The first two pages dealt with institutional and general data related to pastoral relationships, plant, and the program of student work. The final five pages dealt with questions relating to the five peculiar functions of the university parish pastor as they are operative in relation to student life; namely, preaching, counseling, teaching, evangelism, and administration.

3. Review of Procedure

Early in the dissertation a hypothesis was adopted to wit that the prototypes or models of the ideal university parish pastor and the typical or average university parish pastor who labors in the field can be projected, that their performances can be compared and contrasted, and that as a result of this procedure useful information will be discovered that can help the pastor who serves such a church to increase the proficiency and the effectiveness of his ministry to student life.

The prototype of the ideal university parish pastor was projected around the five functions which are peculiarly operative in the ministry of this pastor as he relates to students.

Using returns from the questionnaire as a means for discovering what is being done by university parish pastors in the field, the prototype of a typical or average pastor who serves such a post was created in the following manner. Upon receipt of data from the 224 respondents, data

were tabulated by states and jurisdictions according to the seven pages of information that was solicited. Following an analysis of these data the results were reviewed. These data were then summarized in a portrait of the typical university parish pastor so that they might be compared and contrasted with data illustrating the performance of the ideal pastor and thus prove or disprove the hypothesis.

Following the cross-tabulation of factors in five areas which were believed to be productive of further information, the two types of pastors were compared and contrasted and similarities and differences were noted. The closing paragraphs of this chapter will be devoted to conclusions concerning the validity of the hypothesis and the general value of the cross-tabulations. In the final chapter the writer will present some wider observations and recommendations as a result of conclusions reached in this study.

It will be the objective of the next section of this chapter to present a summation of the characteristics and the performance of the typical university parish pastor in a finished portrait so that it may be used to point up likenesses and differences between his picture and the projected picture of the ideal pastor.

4. The Typical University Parish Pastor

The typical university parish pastor in the United States is a composite creature. He is forty-five years old and serves a church of 975 members which is located six blocks distant from the college or university to which he relates. He has labored for eighteen years as a preacher in the Methodist ranks, averaging 6.8 years as a pastor in a college community. The possibilities are about three to one that he has never served a university parish station before, and it is not likely

that he will be reappointed to another university post when he moves. He holds the minimum educational qualification of a Bachelor of Divinity degree and there is one possibility in four of his having earned a higher academic ranking. He stands a 20 per cent probability of having earned the title "Doctor," but only a 10 per cent chance of having won this distinction through academic attainment. The chances are a little better than two to one that he serves a church that is related to a state college or university instead of a church-related school; and it is better than a six to one probability that his church is related to a tax-supported institution of higher learning instead of an independent school.

He labors near a campus which enrolls 3037 students, of whom 580, or 19 per cent, are registered Methodist-preference enrollees. Of these Methodist-preference students he reaches eighty-eight vitally and an additional 153 casually with his ministry. On any given Sunday morning he preaches to 121 students in his congregation. Full members of his parish church who are college members number 15.5, and his roster of affiliate members registers thirty-four names.

The chances are two to one that his church will be connected with a Wesley Foundation or a Wesley Fellowship. He believes that preaching is the most important single way in which he can serve students, and that counseling is his second most important role in meeting their needs. Other functions of his ministry which the typical university parish pastor considers most important in order of their significance are teaching, evangelism, and administration.

He has had little formal training in student work and almost no clinical experience in exercising the peculiar functions of his ministry as they relate to students; but he would be eager to attend a five-weeks

summer laboratory course set up on a national or regional scale for training in Methodist student work providing he could get time off and secure some financial subsidy for such training. When the Methodist parish pastor is appointed to a college post he quickly discovers that he confronts a task which requires special training in areas of religion in higher education.

Since the university parish pastor believes that preaching is his most important operative function as he relates to students, he believes that the application of basic Christian truths to life situations is more effective than any other type of preaching. Bible-centered sermons rank second in importance. He discovers some correlation between his preaching and the amount of counseling that his sermons elicit among students.

He directs his Sunday sermons at students moderately rather than considerably, being persuaded that temperate use of illustrations from campus life is justified and profitable. He hesitates to use campus jargon for fear of patronizing, but he realizes that he must find suitable ways to communicate with the university mind. He is more inclined than not to do occasional "block-preaching" to students at special seasons and on special days. He recognizes that he has an obligation to enlist the empathy of all segments of his Sunday morning congregation rather than to cater to students.

He finds students somewhat critical of his preaching, but not unjustly so--considering the natural argumentative and rejective pattern which is characteristic of later-adolescence. He would rather have students come to church and be critical of his preaching than have them stay away and be silent. In his estimation probably the average student would rather hear one of the pastor's sermons than he would enjoy discussing

its central theme. He leans towards an admission that a combination of preaching and discussion form a better learning situation and a more properly balanced ration for the student mind than the nurture provided by a diet of one to the exclusion of the other. Annually his pulpit is open to 2.7 guest preachers who are carefully screened for their ability to speak in a manner that is relevant to the university community. He believes that a majority of his students will receive the preaching of such pulpit guests with interest and profit.

The typical university parish pastor has had little formal training and not much clinical experience in the art of counseling, but whether he is adequately trained or not he realizes that one of his chief contributions to student life lies in the realm of counseling. He spends 3.4 hours per week in personal consultation with students, and if he serves in the midwest he does more counseling than if he labors elsewhere in the nation. There is correlation between the amount and quality of his counseling with students and the amount of specialized training that he has had. There is also an evident relationship between the number of years of experience that he has had at a college parish and the amount and quality of his counseling.

The typical university parish pastor is more willing to structure counseling situations with students than not, although frequently he does so unconsciously. He thinks that his preaching produces more personal interviews than any other single activity on his part. However, he feels that participating in student activities and just being available together produce nearly as many counseling situations as his preaching.

He is more likely to use a combination of counseling methods than to employ any single technique of counseling. He has more success with

the non-directive or reflective method of counseling than with any other single procedure. Just listening is his second most effective fashion of conducting personal interviews, and the giving of advice is recognized as the least valid method of counseling with college students.

In his opinion, moral and spiritual problems rank highest of the areas that vitally concern college students. He believes that emotional, vocational, educational, marital and family, social, alcohol, and health problems rank next in order of importance.

The typical college pastor is more inclined than not to refer students who are in need of professional physical or mental treatment to physicians who are skilled in therapy. This score would be higher if qualified professional help were always available and less expensive. He may or may not have had some formal or specialized training for the recognizing of symptoms of emotional disturbances of college students which aids him in referring, but such training is usually limited. The chances are about one to five that he has done some clinical counseling under supervision, and if he has had such training he is twice as likely to labor in the West than in any other part of the nation. The older he becomes past a certain age and the closer he comes to retirement, the less inclined he is to reinforce his technical counseling skills with additional specialized training.

The typical college pastor is a better preacher than he is a listener, but he has a feeling that he ought to be doing more and better counseling. Because of the press of the Methodist system and the daily demands made upon him by his pastoral ministry he has had little opportunity to keep abreast of the flood of literature which has been produced recently in this field.

As for fulfilling his university teaching function in the university community, the typical university parish pastor stands one chance in five of conducting some sort of a course in religion for credit on the local campus. He has a strong inclination to offer students the opportunity to learn churchmanship through participation in activities of the local church which require little or no training. One member of his student group serves on the Official Board and is a Commission member.

This pastor believes that he needs more fundamental knowledge of and experience with the principles of religious education and general education. He is not much disturbed by legal complaints raised against religious activities in the local campus community, but when such complaints are lifted loudly he would like to know how he can interpret the laws of the state so that he might become a means of synthesizing points of view and bringing about a proper understanding of legal rights involved among the administration, the school and the community. He exercises his teaching function in conducting classes for credit on the local campus at 20 per cent of his teaching potential, and he exercises his teaching function in teaching other groups in which students are invited to participate without credit at an additional 30 per cent of his teaching potential.

In fulfilling the obligations of his evangelistic function within the university community, the typical pastor is able to secure religious preference registrations of students on the campus without difficulty. He finds the Woman's Society of Christian Service program for providing advance-registration of new Methodist students through the student-secretary of that organization about 70 per cent effective, and wishes that this valuable aid to this ministry could be perfected.

He does not offer strong encouragement to students to enroll as members of the local church either in full relation or by affiliate membership. He believes that there is little or no place for revivalism in contemporary campus evangelism, and he is persuaded that personal, continuous witnessing by students in every day campus life is their most effective form of evangelism. He has mixed feelings about the use of visitation enlistment by students among their fellows. He would like to see this phase of campus evangelism succeed, but he has only moderate to little success in teaching students to use it acceptably. He is in favor of stressing campus evangelism with a steady emphasis, with some seasonal accent, rather than spasmodically attempting to fulfil his responsibility to students in this area of his ministry.

There is a three to one chance that he takes part in a Religious Emphasis Week or some similar periodic observance on the campus of his related school. He is sure that all the answers are not in concerning campus evangelism and that a "moral equivalent" for yesterday's soul-winning witnessing for Christ by students among students is overdue. He is aware of the fifty-seven foreign students on his campus from many countries of the world, but he hesitates to relate to them. He "uses" the foreign student more frequently than he serves him. He has only begun to realize the potential for modern campus evangelism which prevails in relating to foreign students who come to America seeking economic, agricultural, engineering, and inspirational knowledge with which to solve critical enigmas in their own countries.

Regarding the fulfilling of his administrative function, the typical pastor enjoys a two to one probability of relating to students through some form of a Campus-Church Relations Committee. There is an

83 per cent possibility that his student group has a recognized relationship with the Methodist Student Movement, and only a 43 per cent chance that the college-age group in his church is vitally related to an ecumenical youth movement.

The annual budget of his student group is $3,000, and it becomes a major responsibility on his part to promote the solicitation of part of this budget. There is an 83 per cent possibility that he bears at least some responsibility for public relations in connection with student work at his church, and there is an 80 per cent probability that he feels that contact with the Division of Higher Education at Nashville should be maintained.

He stands one chance in ten of being related to an organization of Methodist faculty members on his campus and about one chance in six of being identified with a Faculty Christian Fellowship, but his inclination to help organize such a fellowship where none exists is measured at 43 per cent. Although the possibility of a united Protestant student group on his campus is 56 per cent, the probabilities of his participating in such a group are only 45 per cent. While there is an inter-faith group on 40 per cent of the campuses measured in the study, the likelihood of his being identified with such an organization is measured at 27 per cent.

He is strong in his belief (80 per cent) that appointment to a university parish pastorate should be regarded as a special calling, and he equally shares the opinion that when a pastor trains for a university parish and does acceptable work he ought to expect a "reasonable" degree of security at such a type of station under the Methodist appointive system. Such "security" is not provided at present.

B. Comparison of the Typical Pastor and the Ideal Pastor

In order to determine the validity of the hypothesis of this study it is time now to contrast and compare the respective performances of the typical university parish pastor and the ideal pastor at such a post.

In pointing up the similarities and the differences between these two clergymen, the reader will remember that the ideal pastor is a projected creature of perfection. He does not exist, nor can he exist this side of the millenium, because he represents an embodiment of righteousness and wisdom with which the Almighty has not yet chosen to endow humans. The perfection that is pictured in the ideal pastor cannot be attained by the typical pastor, but his perfection might be approached. It will be the objective of this section of the dissertation to determine to what degree the typical pastor approaches the perfection of the ideal pastor, as well as to designate certain areas in which he might narrow the gap between his performance and the performance of the ideal pastor.

A high degree of variation was discovered between the performances of the two pastors. Certain magnitudes of variance in performance between the pastors of the separate jurisdictions is discernable. An effective way in which to measure this imbalance between the roles of the two pastors is to examine their respective performances in regard to the fulfilling of their five functions as they relate to student life. This will be done in following paragraphs, beginning with the preaching function.

1. Preaching

The perfect sermon has never been preached by any mortal, and styles of preaching vary so greatly in respect to the personality of the

preacher that it would be difficult to judge how closely the preaching artistry of the typical pastor approaches the homiletical ability of the ideal pastor.

In projecting the preaching qualifications of the ideal pastor at a university situation it has been established that he ought to have a good mind, a well grounded education, deep convictions, religious insights, and a positive approach to life situations. And he ought to be a good preacher.[1] In light of data returned in this study, the typical pastor scores rather highly in these areas of performance. Probably he is not a great preacher, but he does try to preach sermons that are relevant to the needs of the college and university community, and he does speak with some precision at the point of the intellectual process. Moreover, he possesses warm friendliness and is usually approachable.

Areas in which he could improve his preaching are in his knowledge of the nature of religious experience, a more solid theological foundation for his communicative effort, and a more satisfactory rephrasing of theological language so that his sermons would be more relevant to the experience of his hearers.

The typical pastor scores highly in his resolution to apply the basic truths of the Christian faith to life situations in his preaching and in his decision to rate Bible-centered sermons and theological preaching on a high plane. The ideal pastor agrees in this judgment.

If there is virtue in assuming that the ideal pastor would desire a high degree of relationship between his preaching and the quantity and quality of his personal conseling, then the typical pastor needs to raise the level of his performance in this regard.

---

[1] Above, p. 92.

His performance approaches the performance of the ideal pastor in directing Sunday sermons at students moderately rather than considerably, and his temperate use of campus jargon is justified for fear of patronizing. He scores high in his love for students.

All in all, it is observed that the typical pastor does rather well when his preaching performance is compared with the preaching performance of the ideal pastor. Being human, he could stand some improvement in fulfilling his forensic function in the university community. Preaching is probably his strongest forte, and it is in this area of his ministry to students that he appears to render his best service. He is a better preacher than he is a counselor, but this is a matter for discussion in the next section.

2. Counseling

Upon examination of data returned in this study, the observer feels that whereas the typical pastor considers that his role of counseling with students is probably as important as his ministry of preaching, in comparison with the performance of the ideal pastor he is doing rather a poor job of counseling. A major share of the blame for his below par performance in this area of his ministry to students might be due to his lack of specialized training and formal instruction in counseling. If he has been preaching for eighteen years he finished his graduate seminary training during a period when instruction in the art of contemporary counseling was in its infancy. Unless he has returned to seminary or enrolled in special courses for clinical experience under competent teachers he is not qualified to do extensive counseling with students on a qualitative basis. The fact that 44 per cent of the pastors concerned

in this nationwide study do not feel that there is considerable relationship between a pastor's preaching at a university pulpit and the counseling which results from his preaching provides cause for serious reflection.

While it would be difficult to establish an "ideal" number of counseling hours which the ideal pastor would consider adequate for exercising this function in the service of students, the fact that the typical pastor spends only 3.4 hours per week in this activity illustrates his rather limited participation in this area of ministry to student life.[1] In two large jurisdictions only 2.7 hours per week are spent by the average university pastor in counseling. And a search of data shows that some pastors of major university communities report no hours of counseling with students. There is room for improvement here.

Evidence shows that the typical pastor could improve his ministry by doing more to structure counseling situations with students whereby they would be more inclined to seek him out for personal interview. It is to his credit that he employs the non-directive or reflective method of counseling to the exclusion of any other single method, and that he regards the giving of advice as the poorest means of counseling. It is agreed that the typical pastor should be more informed about emotional and problem areas of student concern so that he might be able to recognize these areas with some degree of skill.

In referring students who have emotional disturbances to specialists for treatment, the typical pastor fails to measure up to standards set by the ideal pastor by nearly 50 per cent. Much of his failure in this area appears to stem from his lack of formal training. The degree

---

[1]Above, p. 298.

of clinical experience in counseling that is reported by the typical pastor is low in comparison to the clinical experiences of the ideal pastor. This experience ranks highly in the estimation of the ideal pastor.

If the typical pastor would emulate the practice of the ideal pastor in the realm of personal counseling, he will establish regular hours when his services are available. He would also do well to publish the hours of his availability and make it easier for students to approach him when they are in need of personal interviews. And he would profit by following the example of the ideal pastor in serving as a chaplain for the university infirmary, ever on the alert to relate to students who are ill.

3. Teaching

In fulfilling the function of his teaching ministry to students, the performance of the typical pastor comes up considerably short of the performance of the ideal pastor. He is only 20 per cent inclined to teach credit courses for religion on the campus. This figure might be higher if limitations were not imposed upon such teaching. But only 30 per cent of the remaining 80 per cent of the university parish pastors involved in this study teach any other kind of a class or group on a formal or informal basis for which credit is not received. Thus, about one-half of these pastors admit that they never engage in any kind of teaching other than the teaching involved in their sermons and impromptu discussion. By their admission they do not conduct classes in church membership, the basic tenets of the Christian faith, missions, stewardship, teacher-training, workshops, or in any of the many educational

areas which are recommended for the intellectual and spiritual growth of Methodists by their National Boards and Commissions.

The typical pastor rates only about a 45 per cent score in providing an opportunity for training students in churchmanship, and he scores only two per cent better in offering teacher-training courses which are open for the edification of members of the college community.[1] As for inviting students to share in local church activities, the typical pastor is only 76 per cent inclined to ask students to teach in the Church School, 66 per cent willing to ask them to help with ushering, and 75 per cent disposed to invite their participation in officiating at Sunday services. The writer feels that there is room for considerable improvement in these important phases of teaching, if the typical pastor would come up to the performance of the ideal pastor. He would also profit by inviting more students to serve as members of his Official Board and as learning participants in commission and committee activities.

The typical pastor confesses that he needs considerable more knowledge of the principles of religious education and the psychology of religion than he has. He also admits that he does not know as much about the fundamental dynamics and principles of general progressive education as he should.

The typical pastor implies that he is not well informed in regard to state and local laws which might appear to restrict and/or limit the teaching of religion or the engaging in religious activities on the campuses of state and public institutions of higher learning. In general, therefore, it would appear that the typical pastor must make some improvement if he would approximate the performance of the ideal pastor in

---

[1] Above, p. 310.

discharging the obligations demanded by his teaching ministry to student life.

4. Evangelism

The performance of the typical pastor in fulfilling his evangelistic obligation to student life varies considerably when it is compared with the performance of the ideal pastor. The variation ranges from wide discrepancy to reasonable nearness. This pastor is in constant need of re-examining his commitment to God in light of his original obligation to be an evangelist. Often he is so pressed by details and administrative duties that he neglects to serve students in this important area. He is aware of his need to re-think the total concept of evangelism as it relates to campus life. He agrees that a substitute for yesterday's "soul-winning witness" for Christ by students to other students must be found, but he is perplexed as to where to look for such a substitute that will produce acceptable results on the contemporary campus.

He makes a better score in certain areas of his evangelistic stewardship than in others. He shows remarkable proficiency in securing religious preference registrations of new students through the cooperation of the admihistration of his related college, and he efficiently takes advantage of the Woman's Society of Christian Service service for pre-registering Methodist students.[1] In encouraging students to become members of his church in some relationship he lags behind the performance of the ideal pastor by 23 per cent. The typical pastor does not closely approach the performance of the ideal pastor in the reaching of Methodist-preference students on his campus either vitally or casually.

---

[1] Above, p. 337.

A review of Table 57 of Chapter XVI,[1] which summarizes cross-tabulation of the performance of pastors whose students do considerable visitation enlistment among their fellows, reveals demonstrable proof as to how nearly the typical pastor could approach the performance of the ideal pastor in the areas of reaching students, enrolling them in his Sunday morning congregations, and offering them membership in the church--providing he were willing to try to teach his student group how to witness by word of mouth among their fellows and "follow through" with an acceptable plan of campus evangelism.

Again, as visualized in Chapter XIV,[2] the typical pastor needs to approximate more closely the perfection of the ideal pastor's performance in the matter of ministry to foreign students. If he would exploit foreign students less and discover more creative ways in which to relate to them, the cause of the Kingdom would be enhanced.

5. Administration

In comparing the administrative performance of the typical pastor with that of the ideal pastor, a number of discrepancies become clear. When it is discovered, for example, that nearly one-third of the pastors involved in this study have not organized any kind of a Campus-Relations Committee as virtually demanded by the Discipline[3], one wonders how this large segment of pastors can measure up to their full potential in serving the needs of student life.

---

[1] Above, p. 442.

[2] Above, p. 361.

[3] Discipline for 1960, p. 379.

The observer wonders why less than one-half of the student groups involved in this study claim a participating relationship with such ecumenical bodies as the World's Student Christian Federation, and he suggests that the typical pastor would be rendering a significant service if he would help to lift the eyes of his students from local needs to a vision of world fellowship.

The typical pastor could considerably improve the record that he has established in participating with inter-faith groups, and he could become more willing to serve as a "middleman" in synthesizing religion and academic disciplines on his related campus. While he cannot take the initiative in organizing faculty fellowship groups, he can begin with the Methodist faculty personnel who are members of his church and acquaint them with the plan of the Faculty Christian Fellowship. His performance in these activities ranks low in comparison with the performance of the ideal pastor.

The willingness of the typical pastor to recognize his rightful administrative role in bearing responsibility for the solicitation of financial resources for the support of student work on his related campus (whenever such solicitation is needed) is not as pronounced as the willingness of the ideal pastor.

The prototypes of the ideal pastor and the typical pastor having been projected and compared and contrasted, it is time now to make a conclusion about the hypothesis.

C. A Conclusion Concerning the Hypothesis

According to the hypothesis that was stated at the beginning of this dissertation, the writer claimed that the prototypes or models

of the ideal university parish pastor and the typical or average university parish pastor who labors in the field can be projected, that their performances can be compared and contrasted, and that as a result of this procedure useful information will be discovered that can help the pastor who serves such a church to increase the proficiency and the effectiveness of his ministry to student life.

The writer has demonstrated that it is possible to project such a prototype of the ideal university parish pastor. He has also demonstrated that it is possible to project a picture of the typical or average university parish pastor who labors in the field.

Also, it has been possible to compare and to contrast the behaviour of these two types of pastors, and out of this procedure the writer has demonstrated that useful information has been discovered which can help the pastor who serves such a church to increase the proficiency and the effectiveness of his ministry to student life.

Thus, it is the conclusion of the writer that data which have been assembled, tabulated, analyzed, and observed in this study present reasonable evidence that proves the validity of the hypothesis which was suggested at the beginning of the dissertation.

D. A Conclusion Concerning the Cross-Tabulations

As the writer comes to a final conclusion about the cross-tabulations which have been described in Chapter XVI, he believes that such a conclusion merits special mention. He approaches this matter with mixed feelings. It is true that at first the prospects of these correlations were promising. It is also true that information has resulted from the cross-tabulations. But how much that information is

worth and how much that information can be used in the final analysis are matters of conjecture that must be carefully weighed.

The findings of the correlations produce striking information that appears to be conclusive. But perhaps the data are too impressive. In the light of all the facts that have been assembled from these correlations (and in the light of their total implications), the possibility that the observer can conclude too much from these data too easily is real. Some of these data are difficult to defend. Many of the conclusions that arise from these findings are probably true, but there may be better grounds upon which to argue their defense.

In spite of his mixed feelings, the writer is glad that he attempted the correlations. He maintains that even if such an experimental procedure had produced no new usable information, the fact that the experiment was carried out produced a learning situation. Under the critical eye of the observer the following flaw comes to light. There was considerable variation in the size of the "control-groups" of churches, schools, and blocks of Methodist-preference material with which the separate groups of pastors were related. This variation posed a problem.

For example, it was impossible to select enough "younger" pastors who served the same type and size of churches and campus situations as those that were served by the "older" pastors. Probably this selection produced factors which were extremely variable for true correlation. Also, since the writer found it impossible to discover anough "control-groups" for correlation that were of appreciable size, it is possible that the small number of pastors who made up the respective "control-groups" used in these cross-tabulations contributed to unrealistic findings.

There were not enough churches involved in the study to produce sufficient situations that were of comparable size and background. The writer has explained the difficulty that was encountered when the correlation involving the nebulous behaviour-pattern of "visitation enlistment" was selected for observation and measurement.

The trustworthiness of some of the information that was produced may be open to question, but the writer's being able to observe the results of these cross-tabulations in the light of their possible value to the study as a whole has been worthwhile. The arranging of returns by jurisdictions has provided a learning situation which should not be minimized. Probably the dissertation could stand without the correlations. But in spite of the limiting factors, if the findings of these cross-tabulations indicate trends and point towards needs and opportunities which should be explored further, then the experiment has proved valuable.

An evaluation of the entire study, as well as some wider observations and conclusions, will be made in the final chapter which follows.

CHAPTER XVIII

EVALUATION AND CONCLUSION

Having presented a general summary in the preceding chapter, as well as a testing of the original hypothesis and a major conclusion concerning its validity, the author will now present a final evaluation and some concluding suggestions and recommendations.

A. Evaluation of the Study

In evaluating the results of this study, some kind of a summation must be made not only of the statistical results produced by tabulated data, but due regard also must be made of the hundreds of opinions, attitudes, and convictions expressed between the lines by respondents at the request of the questioner. While it is impossible to tabulate these opinions, attitudes and feelings as scientifically or as objectively as it is to diagram the statistical results of the study in a schematic system, the total thrust of their implications must be considered in relation to the statistical findings.

In this kind of an investigation it is reasonable to presume that many meaningful discoveries cannot be expressed in statistics or percentage points. Consequently they may be construed by the sociologist as unscientific. Nevertheless, they become established convictions in the mind of the observer which must be carefully weighed in a final analysis. In evaluating these findings the observer is impressed by

several convictions which are not subject to interpretation by the slide rule or the adding machine.

First, he is overwhelmed by the magnitude of the university parish pastor's job. He is amazed by the interdependence of his work with and upon the labor of others in the college community, the Annual Conference, the General Conference, the Board of Education of the Methodist Church, and all the units of the Methodist Student Movement that work together in ministering to the religious needs of students on the American college campus. At this point the observer begins to understand the philosophy behind Harold F. Carr's reasoning when he describes the preacher at a college situation as one of a team. He says that the place which the pulpit of the college pastor occupies, "is very dependent upon the work which others than preaching ministers are doing."[1]

Secondly, he is impressed with the enormous scope of the task which is being accomplished on behalf of students and the university community through the dedicated ministry of Methodist pastors who are appointed to a campus-related churches. The range of their accomplishments as they labor in religious guidance of the university community in addition to fulfilling the heavy demands made upon them by the local parish church is astonishing.

One is overcome with a profound and humbling sense of gratitude to God for his benevolent blessing upon the Methodist Student Movement

---

[1]Harold F. Carr, "The College Preacher," Religion in Higher Education, ed. Milton Towner (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1931), p. 160.

and the labor of its consecrated workers from the personnel of the Methodist Board of Education at Nashville on down to the last student and faculty member who are helping to create a "community of Christians" at the level of the college campus.

Thirdly, upon observation of these data the observer is impressed with the tremendous investment which is being made through this growing movement to evangelize students and to provide them with religious guidance. One observes that this investment includes hundreds of thousands of budgetary dollars that are contributed annually by local churches, students, faculty members, alumni, laymen, and interested friends. Also the dedicated service of hundreds of trained professional student workers, plus the contribution of thousands of hours of service by volunteer students and laymen, are involved.

As the university parish pastor reviews the history of religion in higher education he is astonished at the accomplishments of Wesley Foundations, Wesley Clubs, and other student groups that are organized in the university parish church and he marvels at the significant contributions that they are making in the integration of the university towards the goal of a "community of Christians." He becomes more aware of his own vital relationship to these groups.

As he reviews the record of the quadrennial emphasis of the General Conference of The Methodist Church on Christian higher education for the years 1956-60, and as he notes the continued interest in the cause of Christian higher education that is reflected in legislation

of the 1960 session of the General Conference, the observer is impressed with the timeliness and the propriety of the motives and the decisions of the governing body of The Methodist Church in placing the needs of the university community first in its consideration for study and implementation. He is challenged and impelled to discover how he can find his place in the over-all scheme of the original quadrennial plan of the General Conference and how he can best fit into that plan.

This leads the observer to conclude that truly the arms of The Methodist Church are at work on the campus, undergirded by the prayers, the financial support, and the heartfelt blessing of the church at many levels. This is as it should be, because students are important. They have a right to the best ministry that the Church can afford. If the life of the student may be shaped and molded by the nature of his academic environment, his religious bent also may be inclined and nurtured on the campus through the provision of a warm and challenging student Christian program of religion which will seek him out and invite his participation, thereby offering him an opportunity to grow into a mature and integrated person who is ably equipped to take his place in the "community of Christians."

College students come from every community in their respective states, and from many different nations. They represent every walk of life and every kind of social structure. The only contact that some of them may ever have with organized religion is with a Christian student group witnessing on the campus, who have as their friend and counselor

the pastor of the near-campus church. Never again will a similar opportunity for evangelization come their way! That the university parish pastor is becoming more and more cognizant of the part he plays in this drama is evident upon observation of the data at hand.

Fourthly, the observer is impressed by the magnitude of the data which have been amassed as a result of this study. Never before have so many university parish pastors been invited to share the results of their labors in a corporate pooling of what they are doing in the field as they endeavor to interpret the original General Conference quadrennial emphasis on Christian Higher Education and to fulfill their ministry to students and the university community. He is also moved by the wide variation in the performance of university pastors from one jurisdiction to another. Never before has it been possible to compare and contrast the techniques of college preachers as they labor in the interest of the spiritual growth of students and faculty members in the respective sections of the nation.

Fifthly, an evaluation of the findings that were discovered in the cross-tabulations described in chapter XVI would be in order at this juncture. But because the writer has already made an evaluation of these correlations in the preceding chapter, another appraisal of them will not be made here.

Lastly, in the concluding stages of the inquiry one is able to gain an objective over-all view of the value of the study. When data are tabulated, comparing and contrasting concluded, analyses made,

observations noted, the hypothesis tested, and conclusions drawn, the results signify that a learning procedure has taken place. When the university parish pastor discovers that he is not alone in his search for better techniques and means of serving students so that they may grow spiritually and thus be led into the fellowship of the Christian community, when he discovers the areas of student work in which he is functioning poorly, and when, through comparing and contrasting his ministry with the ministry of the ideal pastor, he understands how he can improve his ministry to students--then perhaps he will be challenged to bring his performance more nearly in accord with what it should be and with what it can become. Then he will be able to discover "handles" by which he can take hold of his work more intelligently, and he will experience less of a feeling that he is laboring in the dark at a task which might be beyond the possibility of fulfillment.

B. Concluding Suggestions and Recommendations

In conclusion, the writer makes eight positive suggestions which, in light of the findings of this study, he believes would further implement the results of this inquiry and be a means os translating them into action. These positive suggestions include (1) some functional recommendations, (2) an extended study of campus evangelism, (3) a recommendation for a parallel study of junior colleges, (4) a plan for the specialized training of university parish pastors, (5) a recommendation to Methodist

Bishops and Cabinets, (6) a recommendation to the Council of Bishops, (7) a plea for continued emphasis on Christian Higher Education, and (8) the publication of a handbook which summarizes the findings of this study. Let us now turn to a consideration of these suggestions and recommendations seriatum.

1. Some Functional Recommendations

A number of pastors who were solicited in this study failed to report information regarding one or more of the following: (1) the organization of a student Christian group on the campus or within the local near-campus Methodist Church which has an acknowledged relationship with the Methodist Student Movement, (2) the existence of any kind of a campus-church committee, board, or governing body for the facilitation of student work, and/or (3) the employment of a full time or part time professional Foundation Director or student worker. In view of these facts, the writer makes the following functional recommendations.

In the best interest of student Christian work and in the interest of an improved ministry of the university parish pastor to student life at the above situations, the writer recommends that the plan of the Methodist Discipline for the formation of some kind of a Methodist foundation, club, or student group be followed in every college-related Methodist church where such an organization does not exist, and that these organizations establish a working-relationship with the Methodist Student Movement.

He also recommends that one of the three acceptable forms of governing bodies for student work be organized where such a Board or committee does not now function. Furthermore, he recommends that steps be taken towards the employment of a full time or part time professional Foundation Director or student worker at university churches where such a director or worker is not now employed, if the size of the constituency warrants.

Suggestions for implementing these recommendations follow.

a) Campus-Church Relations Committee. The importance of the work of the Campus-Relations Committee, the Board of Directors of the Wesley Foundation, and/or the Committee on Campus Religious Life has been outlined previously. The performances of student groups whose pastors report such a committee or board has been compared with the performances of student groups which do not report such a committee or board, and the superior record of the former groups has been demonstrated so conclusively that the formation of such a committee, if it does not now exist, is imperative.

A description of these committees or this board, how they are organized and how they function will be found in section three, paragraph 1365, Chapter VIII of the 1960 Methodist Discipline.[1] Additional help and information may be obtained by writing to the Department of College and University Religious Life of the Board of Education, Box 871, Nashville, Tennessee. It is further recommended that the parish pastor

---

[1] Discipline for 1960, p. 379.

of the local church exercise his willingness to lead and/or to assist in the formation of such a committee or board where it is not now operating.

b) A Methodist student group related to the Methodist Student Movement. Inasmuch as the original emphasis on Christian Higher Education by the Quadrennial Commission of the General Conference presupposed some kind of a student organization at every campus where Methodist work is under-taken, it is the recommendation of this study that such student work be formally organized with official relation to the Methodist Student Movement on every campus where Methodist work is undertaken but where no such organization exists. This organization may take the form of a Wesley Foundation at the scene of a tax-supported school or an independent university. Or it may take the form of a Wesley Fellowship, Wesley Club, or some other group of a similar nature at other types of schools, providing application is made and accepted for relationship to the Methodist Student Movement. Descriptions of these organizations and how they can be formed will be found in paragraphs 1365 to 1369 of the Methodist Discipline.[1] Further information and assistance in the formation of these student-groups may be obtained from the Department of College and University Religious Life of the Board of Education at Nashville, Tennessee. It is further recommended that the parish pastor of the local church exercise his willingness to lead and/or to assist

---

[1]Discipline for 1960, pp. 379-381.

in the formation of such a student group where it is not now functioning.

c) A professional student worker. If there are a large number of Methodist-preference students enrolled in any college where Methodist work is undertaken, it is obvious that the pastor of the related parish church requires competent assistance to aid him in ministering to the needs of student life. Such assistance becomes mandatory if the parish church adjoins the campus of a tax supported university or a large independent college. Smaller churches that cannot afford a full time student worker can take steps towards the employment of a part time professional helper. The duties of such a part time student worker might be combined with the performance of other services about the church. If the latter plan were effected it should be designed with care. Exacting job analyses must be skillfully designed, and the staff member must be made directly responsible to a unified authority. It should be thoroughly understood that this arrangement is at best a poor substitute for full time service, and it should be agreed that the plan will continue only until such a time as the employee can be hired as a Foundation Director or as student worker on a full time basis.

In employing a student worker the parish pastor will exercise his obligation and prerogative in helping to lay the financial foundation necessary for the undergirding of such a program. Through correspondence and cooperation with the Department of College and University Religious

life of the Board of Education at Nashville he can learn about the qualifications required of such a professional student worker, and he can also receive valuable suggestions and aid from this Board in finding such a worker.

The Board of Education at Nashville has a record of Methodist university parish pastors, as well as a record of every director or associate director of Wesley Foundation or student worker nor laboring in the field or who has taken special training which qualifies him for student work. This Board also knows about undergraduate students who are planning to make student work their vocation. Furthermore, this Board publishes a current list of qualified workers who are seeking employment and serves, to a limited degree, as a clearing house for the listing of several classes of religious educators, teachers, administrators, and professional workers within the university community who may be in demand by the connectional institutions and organizations of higher education in America.

In the event that the parish church decides to employ a Wesley Foundation Director or a professional student worker, the writer recommends that a personnel committee of the local Campus-Church Relations committee or the Board of Managers hold a conference with the prospective candidate before his engagement to discuss such matters as qualifications, job analysis, objectives and directives, salary and housing. The District Superintendent, the Bishop, and the Board of Education of the Annual Conference are all concerned in this matter (particularly if the candidate

is an ordained man and subject to a conference appointment) and should be invited to the meeting.

Upon the employment of a Wesley Foundation director or a professional student worker the first act of the Personnel Committee of the Board of Directors or Campus-Church Relations body should be to make a job-analysis for the new student worker in writing. This will establish a clear understanding as to what his functions and responsibilities are. The job analysis should be stated as clearly as possible and copies should be made available to all who are concerned. Such an analysis ought to delineate the relation of the student worker to the student program, to the local religious groups in the parish church and university community, to the university parish pastor (who may or may not be the pastor-director of the student group), and to the other departments of the local church. The job of the student worker having been analyzed, let him to go to work at it with as little interference as possible by the parish pastor or his governing Board. If guidance is needed by the student worker it can be provided in a manner which will not be misinterpreted or destroy his self-confidence.

Inasmuch as the success or failure of the way a university church serves the needs of student life depends upon a harmonious working-relationship between the parish pastor and the Director of the Wesley Foundation or student group at such a church, personal relations between the pastor and the student worker need at all times to be maintained on a high plane. The preaching pastor should have more than a casual interest in

the welfare of his associate and his family. He should be interested with brotherly concern in such matters as status, security, spiritual growth and happiness as they relate to his associate or assistant. And there must be a reciprocal inter-action on the part of the student worker with the pastor if an exemplary working-relationship between them is to be maintained. The pastor and the student worker must respect the integrity of one another.

2. An Extended Study of Campus Evangelism.

Because of the limitations imposed upon this inquiry regarding the university parish pastor's evangelistic obligation to student life, it is the recommendation of this study that the preliminary investigation begun in this field be supplemented by a more exhaustive study of the entire area of campus evangelism. Data concerning the function of evangelism which are revealed in this study provide material for only a fragmentary approach to the problem of campus evangelism as it relates to the university parish pastor. An extended study of this matter is not only merited but demanded.

In retrospect of findings reported by college pastors concerning their exercise of this function, many possibilities for additional creative research are suggested whereby the answers to a number of questions might be found. Thus the ministry of the university parish pastor among students would be enhanced.

For example, the evident conflict that is waged between pastors who encourage visitation enlistment by students among students as against pastors whose students will have no part in such a phase of campus

evangelism needs to be explored. In the light of the superior showing by pastors whose student groups practice this type of campus evangelism, there needs to be a re-thinking and a re-evaluation of this mode of Christian witness in the university community.

In making this recommendation for a re-evaluation of visitation enlistment on the campus, the writer is aware of an emotional block that has grown up around this form of campus evangelism because of its identification with cheap, careless, mechanical gadgetry and superficial techniques designed primarily to get students to "join the Church!" This is a plea for a thorough re-examination of the Master's commission to the seventy when he sent them out to be word-of-mouth witnesses, calling men to be followers of Christ.

Such a program of campus evangelism, if it is to meet with any measure of success, will have to be based not only upon a fundamental understanding of the basic tenets of the Christian faith, but also upon an understanding of the student. If students are to be reached in their outer circumstances they must be reached in their inner conditions. This dissertation has taken for granted a basic understanding of the Gospel of Christ on the part of the university parish pastor. It has taken for granted that the university parish pastor is acquainted with D. T. Niles's declamation that evangelism is "one beggar telling another where to get bread." [1] But this writer has also attempted to outline how the university parish pastor can understand students so that he can reach them in their inner conditions. Such an evangelistic

---

[1] Gerald H. Kennedy, The Marks of a Methodist (Nashville: Methodist Evangelistic Materials, 1960), p. 41.

emphasis cannot be based on a superficial invitation to "come to Jesus," nor upon a call merely to "join the Church." It must be based on a call to Christ in terms that are relevant to the understanding and needs of the student.

This is the focal point and the chief objective of the college and university religious movement of The Methodist Church--to lead students and members of the university community "to accept Christ as their personal Savior, lead them to participate in the fellowship of the Christian life on the campus, and help them to achieve there the richness of the Christian Community."[1]

If this objective is ever to be realized on the campus it must be effected by the students themselves, witnessing under competent leadership. How students can witness to their fellows in "precise, pure, winsome, and truthful"[2] endeavor must be discovered, demonstrated, and taught to other students if the objectives of Christian higher education are to be established on the contemporary campus.

The university parish pastor is the key person in the discovery of this method, its demonstration, and its successful teaching. It is the opinion of the writer that Christ's method of sending out the seventy, two by two,[3] has never been improved upon for effecting personal Christian witness. Probably it will never be surpassed. This should be the core of investigation about which this proposed extended study of campus evangelism should center.

---

[1] Philosophy of Methodist Student Work, p. 7.

[2] Ibid.

[3] Luke 10:1.

The writer believes that a good beginning has been made towards such an extended investigation through data received in this study. Using information gained by observation of facts assembled in this dissertation, the pastors queried in this initial study could be polled a second time in detail as to whether they practice considerable, some or no visitation enlistment of students among students--and why or why not.

Pastors who reported considerable use of the method should be asked to make a complete statement as to exactly how they operate so as to obtain the good results which they report. Pastors who reported some use of the method should be invited to make a detailed description of how they operate and to comment on virtues as well as faults of the method as they observe it in use. Pastors who do not use the method at all should indicate why they do not use it. Others should report instances of their use of this type of campus evangelism that have failed and why they failed.

Such an extended study ought to contain a complete statement as to why the Department of College and University Religious Life of the Methodist Board of Education has ceased its work in what were known as Campus Christian Witness Missions which were an experimental form of lay visitation evangelism on the campus. It is the understanding of the writer that they were discontinued because it was an experiment of importing into the campus certain techniques which were found to be ill adapted to the campus situation. The story should be retold as to how and why this plan to promote Christian witness on the

campus by students among students by word of mouth proved ill adapted to the campus situation and ineffective in the various places where it was undertaken.[1]

To shed further light upon this extended study every one of the university parish pastors who participated in the Campus Christian Witness Missions project and reported failure should be contacted and invited to share his opinion in detail as to where the project broke down and why it failed. There were some pastors who reported good results. Even though they presented a minority report, the complete story of their successes deserves re-analysis. They should be questioned as to exactly how they operated and their opinions should be re-evaluated as to the strengths and weaknesses of the method, and why for them the strengths outweighed the weaknesses.

Undoubtedly the Department of College and University Religious Life of the Board of Education found justifiable evidence to warrant its withdrawal of sanction from this project. But an adequate substitute for word of mouth witness by Christian students among other students has not yet been found, and until something that works better than a carefully planned and executed program of systematic visitation enlistment program of campus evangelism (that apparently DOES work when it is encouraged by certain college pastors) is discovered, it is the judgment of this writer that the method merits re-thinking, re-evaluation, and thorough re-study.

---

[1]Information received in a letter from the Department of College and University Religious Life of the Board of Education of The Methodist Church, P.O. Box 871, Nashville, Tennessee. March 30, 1960.

3. A Parallel Study for Junior Colleges

For reasons which have been suggested previously it has been impossible to include junior colleges in this study. In light of the valuable findings which have resulted from this investigation at four-year college situations, however, it is reasonable to presume that a parallel study conducted among pastors who serve the religious needs of students at junior colleges throughout the nation would produce worthwhile data. It is the recommendation of this dissertation that such a study be carried out.

Pursuant to the initiation of a similar study on the junior college level, it is worthy of note that a splendid beginning in this area of inquiry has already been made at a Conference of the California Junior College Association on Moral and Spiritual Values held at the University of California at Davis January 31 to February 2, 1958. Research for this conference, which was the first of its kind, and which was supported by the Edward W. Hazen Foundation, was furnished by Louise Stoltenberg, research associate at the Pacific School of Religion, in collaboration with Dr. C. P. Shedd, former professor of Religion in Higher Education at the Pacific School of Religion, Berkeley, California. A handbook which was produced in connection with the Davis Conference through cooperation with the Department of Religion in Higher Education at the Pacific School of Religion would be of significant value to any one initiating such a study.[1] Also,

---

[1]California Junior College Association, Proceedings of the Davis Conference on Moral and Spiritual Values held with the cooperation of the Department of Religion in Higher Education of the Pacific School of Religion, Berkeley, California, and supported by the Edward W. Hazen Foundation (Davis, California, January 31-February 2, 1958).

a pamphlet titled A Survey of the Voluntary Student Religious Associations and Clubs of California Public Junior Colleges, which was published under the same auspices in 1957, would be helpful.[1]

4. A Plan for Specialized Training

Inasmuch as the findings of these data clearly indicate the superior quality of student work that is done by university parish pastors who have a fair degree of formal training and specialized instruction in college and university religious leadership, and inasmuch as a high percentage of pastors at such posts indicate that they would be willing to take some formal instruction providing they could find time and financial subsidy to do so, it is a recommendation of this study that such courses of specialized training which have been offered annually at at least two leading Methodist seminaries be augmented, that the way be opened for all university parish pastors in the nation to attend, and that such pastors be challenged through local conference Boards of Education, the Department of College and Religious Life of the Methodist Board of Education, and the Council of Bishops to enroll in such courses.

It is further recommended that courses be offered in at least two additional Methodist seminaries, preferably one in the east and one on the west coast, and that a system of scholarships be devised whereby travel, tuition and board expense of authorized delegates to such schools could be subsidized. The possibility for offering such a course of instruction on an interdenominational basis is unlimited. The question could be asked, "Why is not this a good opportunity for

---

[1] Louise Stoltenberg, A Survey of the Voluntary Student Religious Associations and Clubs of California Public Junior Colleges (Berkeley: Pacific School of Religion, 1957).

cooperative effort, jointly sponsored by a number of denominations and religious groups?"

Specialized courses for college and university religious leadership are now offered over a five week period each summer by the Methodist Student Movement through the Department of College and University Religious Life of the Division of Educational Institutions of the Board of Education of the Methodist Church on the campus of Garrett Biblical Institute of Evanston, Illinois. A similar course is given at the Perkins School of Theology on the campus of Southern Methodist University at Dallas, Texas. Training is available for pastors who are preaching to college students, for directors of religious student life, for adult counselors to students, for special workers among students in Wesley Foundations, and for those who desire to enter such work in the future. The courses are offered on a graduate level and credit may be applied on graduate degrees in theology or religious education.

In these courses which are designed for the training of the university parish pastor in student work religion is not defined as one aspect of the student's life, but it is defined in terms of a way of life which affects his entire educational experience. The instruction includes a survey of student religious work on the American college campus, as well as a study of the student work of the church and other religious agencies that exist to meet the religious needs of students. A survey of program materials that are suitable for use among students and in the university community is presented, and the relationship of the university parish pastor to the growing experience of the student group is investigated.

Opportunity is offered during the presentation of these formal courses to study and discuss the program of religion for college students. An analysis is made of their needs and interests and the problems that arise in campus life. The history of student religious work, including trends and recent development, and also the philosophy of the Methodist Student Movement are considered. The basic background of material covered in Chapters II, III, and IV of this dissertation is presented. The total cost which covers room, tuition, and board at the two seminaries offering training varies from $110 to $155, depending upon which school is attended. Transportation must be added to this figure.

If such a summer course could be attended by the university parish pastor he would profit not only by information gained through fellowship with professors and colleagues in his own category of student work, but he could also audit courses offered for Wesley Foundation directors, college chaplains, and campus counselors and learn to know about their problems in a first hand fashion so that he could orient his campus ministry in relation to their ministry. The writer speaks from personal experience in this regard.

Whether or not pastors who are now serving at university parishes attend such a summer school for training in student work, it is the feeling of this writer that they should avail themselves of the rapidly growing shelf of bibliography in the field of religion in higher education and thus do much to augment their training through intensive reading and home-study. While specific bibliography relating to student work is somewhat limited, there is an expanding library of material available which covers the philosophy of secular and Christian education as

related to campus groups. There is also an abundance of material available from the Department of College and University Religious Life of the Board of Education at Nashville to make a comprehensive study of Methodist student work on the contemporary campus. It is a recommendation of this study that a complete bibliography of this material, together with sources of supply, be made available to the pastors who are concerned.

5. A Recommendation to Methodist Bishops and Cabinets

With due respect to the calibre of consecration and churchmanship which is employed by the respective Bishops and Cabinets of the Annual Conferences of The Methodist Church, it is the recommendation of this study that such Bishops and Cabinets be requested to appoint pastors to churches at college and university communities who are qualified by special training and experience to minister to students--thus pinpointing these strategic pulpits as unique preaching centers. Consultation with the chairmen of the Boards of Education and the Boards of Ministerial Training of the respective Annual Conferences in regard to such appointments is also recommended.

In view of the strategic need for filling college pulpits with acceptably trained and experienced pastors, Bishops and Cabinets are respectfully urged to present a challenge to worthy men who could respond to the prospects of serving at a university pastorate and who would be willing to secure the necessary specialized training to qualify them for such a post. And, in light of data returned in this investigation, it would seem reasonable to ask the Annual Conferences, either individually or corporately, to support a plan for subsidizing the attendance of

university parish pastors at one of the summer schools outlined above and to advocate enrolment as a pre-requisite for such an appointment.

Furthermore, it is a recommendation of this study that respective Bishops and Cabinets be urged to look upon the work of the university pastor as a kind of special calling. They are asked to consider carefully the opinions expressed by a high percentage of the university parish pastors across the nation in regard to their hope for reasonable security at a university post, should they train for this type of ministry and do acceptable work. This recommendation is in no way intended as an affront to the Episcopacy and the Cabinets and their appointive prerogatives which are historically inherent in Methodist polity. It cannot be denied that there is a strong feeling on the part of pastors who responded that even though such special consideration cannot always be granted by the appointive powers when moves are made in and out of university parish pulpits, all things being considered they would hope that the grounds upon which they base their feelings in this matter would be recognized and carefully weighed.

The reader will agree that much Methodist polity is designed to serve the needs of most of the churches which fall into an average-range or category. Because of the large number of Methodist preaching stations in America, most methods and programs are promoted to challenge the average church. But here and there one finds a particular church which, because of a set of problems or circumstances which are uniquely its own, does not fit into the pattern of the typical Methodist preaching appointment. The university parish church is unique in so many ways that often a special "yard stick" must be used to measure its peculiar needs.

Therefore, where possible, it is recommended that the Cabinets of the respective Annual Conferences consider appointment of pastors to university pulpits as a special calling.

6. Recommendation to the Council of Bishops

One of the problems faced by the appointive powers of the respective Annual Conferences is the dearth of pastors who are adequately trained by formal education and experience to serve the needs of the university community in a manner that is relevant to its needs. The fact that some conferences have an abundance of college posts and other conferences have only a few university parish appointments also complicates matters. The following question is raised, "When an Annual Conference has only a few university posts to fill, how justified is any pastor in taking specialized training for such work when he is fairly sure of not being reappointed to a university church within the bounds of his conference if and when he is ready to move?"

In light of these problems, and in light of the findings of this study, the following solution might be suggested. Perhaps a clearing house could be devised whereby through mutual agreement of the Council of Bishops university pastors with specialized training and acceptable qualifications could be "loaned" for periods of time to serve college churches outside their home conferences. In time, if and when practicable, transfers might be arranged. Some centralized bureau of the Methodist Student Movement such as the Department of College and University Religious Life at Nashville might serve as a coordinating agency. It is possible that the merits of such a plan would in time outweigh the demerits.

It is, therefore, a recommendation of this study that the Council of Bishops, in collaboration with the Board of Education and the respective Annual Conference Committees and/or Commissions on Christian Higher Education, carefully consider the feasibility of such a plan, with the idea of setting up an inter-conference clearing house for experimentation in a pilot program.

7. A Plea for Continued Emphasis on Christian Higher Education

It is a further recommendation of this study that recognition be made of the outstanding work that has been accomplished for the cause of religion in higher education by the Board of Education, the Division of Higher Education, and especially the Department of College and University Religious Life of The Methodist Church for the complete, careful, and judicious way in which their directors have designed and continue to administer the Methodist Student Movement.

The writer commends the General Conference action of 1956 which established a quadrennium emphasis on Christian Higher Education. He also commends the General Conference of 1960 for perpetuating important actions relating to higher education which were set in motion by the earlier Conference, and he heartily commends the additional actions on higher education which were made fact during the 1960 session of that legislative body.

Furthermore, it is the recommendation of this study that as empowered by the General Conference of 1960 the Board of Education of The Methodist Church will not only continue to stress the aims of the original Quadrennial Commission but be urged to continue to study the

needs of students in the university community and to go forward in seeking new and creative ways to implement the long range objectives of the cause of religion in higher education.

8. Publication of a Handbook

Finally, it is the shared opinion of the tabulator and the observer of data returned in this study that important findings and conclusions which could be of inestimable value to university parish pastors in the field ought to be passed on to them.

Therefore, it is the concluding recommendation of this investigation that a handbook containing the pertinent findings of this study be published to put into the hands of the 636 university parish pastors who are now serving college-related churches across the nation. The handbook would also be available to pastors who are contemplating appointment to such churches, as well as to younger men who might consider such a ministry to the university community as a special calling. It could be used for reference by pastoral relations committees of university parish churches who need to be advised of the manner in which their pastor might be expected to relate to student life.

Such a handbook would also be available for use in the instruction of pastors at the recommended summer schools of specialized instruction. It is conceivable that this handbook might be placed in the hands of Conference Boards of Education and Ministerial Training for their information and guidance. Moreover, the publication of such a handbook could prove valuable to appointive powers in the respective Annual Conferences in order that they might corroborate their judgment in selecting men for college posts with the findings of 224 men in the field.

Are these eight recommendations too much to ask? Not when we rise to the challenge of Henry P. Van Dusen who pleads,

> Our world cries pitiably for the fruits of Christian Faith, especially in today's youth who must drive a way through tomorrow's hazards and uncertainties--"firmer and stronger character, higher integrity, larger spiritual vision, unimpeachable and unshakable fidelity, what one of our foremost American statesmen keeps pleading for, 'a righteous and dynamic faith.'"[1]

---

[1] Henry Van Dusen, God in Education (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1951), p. 85.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Books

Baker, James C. The First Wesley Foundation. Nashville: The Methodist Publishing House, 1960.

Beach, Waldo. Conscience on Campus. New York: Association Press, 1958.

Bender, Richard N. (ed.) Campus Evangelism in Theory and Practice. Nashville: National Methodist Student Movement, 1957.

Bollinger, H. D. The Student at Prayer. Nashville: The Upper Room, 1960.

Buttrick, George A. Faith and Education. New York: Abingdon-Cokesbury, 1952.

English, O. Spurgeon and Pearson, Gerald H. Emotional Problems of Living. New York: W. W. Norton, Inc., 1945.

Espy, R. H. Edwin. The Religion of College Teachers. New York: Association Press, 1951.

Gauss, Christian. The Teaching of Religion in American Higher Education. New York: Ronald Press, 1951.

Geier, Woodrow A. (ed.) A Perspective on Methodist Higher Education. Nashville: Cokesbury Press, 1960.

Goldsen, Rose K., Rosenberg, Morris, Williams, Robin M. Williams, Jr., Suchman, Edward A. What College Students Think. D. Van Nostrand Co., Inc., 1960.

Harkness, Georgia E. The Resources of Religion. New York: Henry Holt and Co., 1936.

Herberg, Will. Protestant-Catholic-Jew. New York: Doubleday and Company, 1955.

Hutchins, Robert M. The Conflict in Education. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1953.

Jacob, Philip E. Changing Values in College. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1957.

Kennedy, Gerald H. The Marks of a Methodist. Nashville: Methodist Evangelistic Materials, 1960.

Leiffer, Murray H. Methodist Student Work at the Colleges of Arizona, California, and Nevada. Upland, Indiana: A. D. Freese and Sons, 1951.

Lowry, Howard. The Mind's Adventure. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1951.

McCoy, Charles S. and McCarter, Neely D. The Gospel on Campus. Richmond: John Knox Press, 1959.

McMullen, Wayne C. Statistical Methods for Social Workers. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1952.

Miller, Randolph C. Education for Christian Living. Englewood Cliff: Prentice Hall Company, 1956.

Moberly, Sir Walter. The Crisis in the University. London: SCM Press, Ltd., 1949.

Moore, John M. The Place of Moral and Religious Values in Programs of General Education. New Haven: The Hazen Foundation, 1952.

Morris, Eugene. Counseling with Young People. New York: Association Press, 1954.

Ortmayer, Roger (ed.). Witness to the Campus. Nashville: National Methodist Student Movement, 1956.

Shedd, Clarence P. A Century of Christian Student Initiative. New York: Association Press, 1934.

_____. Two Centuries of Student Christian Movements. New York: Association Press, 1934.

_____. The Church Follows Its Students. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1938.

Smith, Seymour. The American College Chaplaincy. New York: Association Press, 1954.

_____. Religious Cooperation at State Universities. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1957.

Straus, Robert and Bacon, Selden. Drinking in College. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1953.

Sullivan, Harry Stack. Conceptions of Modern Psychiatry. New York: W. W. Norton, Inc., 1940.

Temple, Archbishop William. Nature, Man and God. London: McMillan and Company, 1934.

Tewksbury Arnold. The Founding of American Colleges and Universities. New York: Teachers College, Columbia University, 1932.

Van Dusen, Henry. God in Education. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1951.

Walker, Helen M., and Lev, Joseph. Elementary Statistical Methods. New York: Henry C. Holt and Co., 1958.

Wise, W. Max. They Come for the Best of Reasons. Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1958.

Young, Pauline. Scientific Social Studies and Research. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice Hall, Inc., 1956.

Articles and Periodicals

Abbey, Merrill. "Evangelism of the University Community," in Witness to the Campus. Edited by Roger Ortmayer. Nashville: National Methodist Student Movement, 1956.

Carr, Harold F. "The College Preacher," in Religion in Higher Education. Edited by Milton Towner. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1931.

The Daily Christian Advocate (Denver), April 27, 1960. Report No. 3 of the Coordinating Council of the General Conference of the Methodist Church.

_____ (May 9, 1960). Report No. 1 of the Coordinating Council of the General Conference of the Methodist Church.

Fosdick, Harry Emerson. "Personal Counseling and Preaching," in The Best of Pastoral Psychology. Edited by Simon Doniger. Great Neck: Pastoral Psychology Press, 1952.

Garver, Palmer. "A Study of Counselors in Selected Industrial, Educational, and Social Service Organizations." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Northwestern University, as quoted in Shirley A. Hamrin and Blanche B. Paulson (eds.) Counseling Adolescents. Chicago: Science Research Associates, Inc., 1950.

Hartt, Julian N. "The Relevance of Current Theological Thinking to Student Evangelism," in Witness to the Campus. Edited by Roger Ortmayer. Nashville: National Methodist Student Movement, 1956.

Hutson, Harold H. "The Evangelism of the University," in Witness to the Campus. Edited by Roger Ortmayer. Nashville: National Methodist Student Movement, 1956.

Kirkland, William. "The Gospel and the Off-beat Generation," International Journal of Religious Education, XXXVII, No. 5 (January, 1961), 6.

Lankard, Frank Glenn. "Who is the Christian Teacher?" The Christian Advocate. September 13, 1956, p. 7.

Loomer, Bernard M. "Religion and the Mind of the University," in Liberal Learning and Religion. Edited by Amos P. Wilder. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1951.

Moore, James A. "The University Pastor," in Religion in Higher Education. Edited by Milton Towner. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1931.

Nall, T. Otto, "On the Record," The Christian Advocate, June 7, 1956, p. 13.

Pennington, Chester A. "Preaching the Word in the University Church," in Campus Evangelism in Theory and Practice. Edited by Richard N. Bender. Nashville: National Methodist Student Movement, The Board of Education of the Methodist Church, 1957.

Pope, Loren B. "Education in Review," The New York Times, June 7, 1959, section E, p. 11.

Ristow, Cecil F. "The University Church as a Worshipping Fellowship," in Campus Evangelism in Theory and Practice. Edited by Richard N. Bender. Nashville: National Methodist Student Movement, The Board of Education of the Methodist Church, 1957.

San Jose Mercury-News, February 14, 1960, p. 32.

Shannon, Jones B. "Religious Revolution on the Campus," The Saturday Evening Post, March 29, 1958, p. 62.

Shedd, Clarence P. "Religion in Higher Education, Retrospect and Prospect," The Christian Scholar, XXXVIII, No. 4 (December, 1955), 15.

_____. "The University Pastor," in Religion in Higher Education. Edited by Milton Towner. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1931.

Steinbeck, John, and Stevenson, Adlai. "Our Rigged Morality," Coronet, March, 1960, pp. 146-147.

Thomas, George F. "Introduction," in Religious Perspectives in College Teaching. Edited by Hoxie N. Fairchild. New York: Ronald Press, 1952.

Reports, Pamphlets and Leaflets

Bollinger, Hiel D. The Church is With Its Students. An elective unit of study for College Students published by The Abingdon-Cokesbury Press. New York-Nashville.

California Junior College Association. Proceedings of the Davis Conference on Moral and Spiritual Values held with the cooperation of the Department of Religion in Higher Education of the Pacific School of Religion, Berkeley, California, and supported by the Edward W. Hazen Foundation. Davis, California, January 31-February 2, 1958.

Directory of Educational Institutions of The Methodist Church. Leaflet No. 1073-El, issued by the Director of Information and Publications of the Division of Educational Institutions of the Board of Education of The Methodist Church, Box 871, Nashville, Tennessee.

Directory of The Methodist Student Movement. A publication issued by the Department of College and University Religious Life of the Division of Educational Institutions of the Board of Education of the Methodist Church. Nashville, 1959.

Edward W. Hazen Foundation. Report of the Edward W. Hazen Foundation for the years 1925-50. New Haven: Edward W. Hazen Foundation, 1950.

The Faculty Christian Fellowship. A pamphlet issued by The Faculty Christian Fellowship, 257 Fourth Avenue, New York 10, New York.

Fairchild, Hoxie N. Religious Perspectives of College Teaching in Literature. A pamphlet published by the Edward W. Hazen Foundation, New Haven, Connecticut.

General Conference Actions on Higher Education, 1960-64. Leaflet No. 2008-El, issued by the Division of Higher Education of the Board of Education of The Methodist Church. Quoting from Report No. 31, Committee on Education, Calendar 101, of the Daily Christian Advocate.

Gross, John O. and Woodrow A. Geier. Methodist Beginnings in Higher Education. Nashville: the Board of Education of The Methodist Church, 1959.

Harvard Report. General Education in a Free Society. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1945.

The Methodist Church. Doctrines and Disciplines of The Methodist Church. Nashville: The Methodist Publishing House, 1956.

_____. Doctrines and Disciplines of The Methodist Church. Nashville: The Methodist Publishing House, 1960.

The Methodist Student Movement, Annual Report for 1958. A pamphlet issued by the Department of College and University Religious Life of the Division of Higher Education of the Board of Education of The Methodist Church at Nashville, Tennessee.

The Methodist Student Movement. A leaflet published by the Department of College and University Religious Life of the Division of Educational Institutions of the Board of Education of The Methodist Church, Box 871, Nashville, Tennessee.

National Education Association. Moral and Spiritual Values in the Public Schools. A Report prepared by the Educational Policies Commission of the N.E.A. Washington: National Educational Association, 1951.

Outler, Albert C. A Christian Context for Counseling. Hazen Pamphlet number 18. Published by the Edward W. Hazen Foundation, New Haven, Connecticut.

The Philosophy of College and University Religious Work of The Methodist Church. A pamphlet issued by the Department of College and University Religious Life of the Division of Higher Education of the Board of Education of The Methodist Church, Box 871, Nashville, Tennessee.

Plan of Merger of Several Student Christian Movements. A pamphlet issued by the Merger Committee of Three Student Christian Fellowship Groups and distributed by the United Student Christian Council, 257 Fourth Avenue, New York 10, New York, November, 1956.

Professional Student Christian Work in The Methodist Church. A leaflet published by the Department of College and University Religious Life of the Division of Higher Education of the Board of Education of the Methodist Church, Box 871, Nashville, Tennessee.

Report of the Merger Negotiating Committee. A leaflet issued by the Merger Committee of Four Student Christian Movements reporting action taken at a meeting May 5-7, at Columbus, Ohio, and distributed by the United Student Christian Council, 257 Fourth Avenue, New York 10, New York.

Rockefeller Brothers Fund. The Pursuit of Excellence: Education and the Future of America. Special Studies Project Report V, America at Mid-Century Series. Garden City, New York: Doubleday and Company, Inc., 1958.

Shedd, Clarence P. "Moral and Spiritual Values in Public Higher Education," Moral and Spiritual Values in California Junior Colleges. Proceedings of the Davis Conference held at the University of California at Davis, California, January 31-February 2, 1958. Published by the Edward W. Hazen Foundation.

_____. Religion in the State Universities. A pamphlet printed by the Edward W. Hazen Foundation, 400 Prospect Street, New Haven, Connecticut.

Smith, Horace C. Methodism's Obsession with Higher Education. Nashville: The Board of Education of The Methodist Church, 1960.

Statistical Office of the Methodist Church. General Minutes of the Annual Conferences of The Methodist Church. Chicago: Council on World Service and Finance, 1959.

Stoltenberg, Louise. A Survey of the Voluntary Student Religious Associations and Clubs of California Public Junior Colleges. Berkeley: Pacific School of Religion, 1957.

Unpublished Material

Information received in a personal letter from Dr. H. D. Bollinger. Department of College and University Religious Life of the Board of Education, P. O. Box 871, Nashville, Tennessee, March 17, 1960.

Meyer, Samuel. "We State a Need." Excerpt from a paper read before the California-Nevada Methodist Conference Pastor's School at Mt. Hermon, California, April 7, 1959.

Tippett, Donald H. Excerpt from the Council of Administrator's Address to the California-Nevada Conference of the Methodist Church. Mimeographed for distribution May, 1957.

APPENDIX

FROM THE DESK OF
DON S. FLEMING
METHODIST MINISTER
2405 WOOLSEY ST., BERKELEY 5, CALIF.

February 1, 1958

Dear Fellow Pastor
in the College or University Parish:

HOW CAN I SERVE STUDENTS BETTER?

Will you help the 450 preaching pastors at Methodist student centers find answers to this perplexing question?

The enclosed instrument of study is being mailed to all the Methodist ministers of our nation who are preaching in college or university parishes with the profound hope that through their sharing we may come up with some good answers.

It is a nation-wide study.

The study is aimed at the problems and opportunities of the the preacher with particular reference to his ministry to students. It is being carried on under the direction of Dr. Clarence P. Shedd, of the Dept. of Religion and Higher Education at the Pacific School of Religion, and in collaboration with Dr. Hiel Bollinger, of the Dept. of College and University Religious Life of the Methodist Board of Education. (See letters enclosed from them).

I will send you a summary of the findings when they become available. It will be necessary, however, for a majority of the 450 pastors to reply by March 15.

Although this will take a little time, most of the questions may be answered with a quick check-mark. If, however, you have valuable information to share with your brethern concerning one or more of the questions which deal significantly with your situation, please turn that particular sheet(s) over and comment on the reverse side. (Remove staple if you use a typewriter).

This study is strictly for preaching pastors and not Wesley Foundation or student directors.

In eager anticipation and with deepest appreciation, I am

Very sincerely yours,

Don S. Fleming

Don S. Fleming

P.S. The enclosed stamped envelope is for your convenient reply.

DEPARTMENT OF COLLEGE AND UNIVERSITY RELIGIOUS LIFE

H. D. BOLLINGER · HARVEY C. BROWN · JAMESON JONES · ROGER E. ORTMAYER · RICHARD N. SENDER · B. J. STILES

The Board of Education

DIVISION OF EDUCATIONAL INSTITUTIONS
JOHN OWEN GROSS, GENERAL SECRETARY

THE METHODIST CHURCH

BOX 871 • NASHVILLE 2, TENNESSEE
TELEPHONE BROADWAY 7-6400

December 13, 1957

Dear Fellow Pastor:

Under this cover you will receive an instrument of study for the college or university parish pastor which merits comment.

This instrument will become the key, it is hoped, by which several locked doors may be opened to the pastor of a college or university parish church so that he may become a better pastor to Methodist students.

The chief aim of the study is to aid and enrich the religious life of Methodist students and their companions on campuses of American institutions of higher learning.

The study is designed by the Reverend Don S. Fleming, under the direction of Dr. Clarence P. Shedd, formerly of Yale University, and now a member of the faculty of the Pacific School of Religion, Berkeley, California, and in consultation with myself.

Mr. Fleming has been pastor of two state university parish pulpits and is eager to make a contribution which may prove invaluable to all of us who are interested in student work.

I believe that such a study will prove worthwhile in the program and parish ministry of our college and university churches. This is the kind of study that has never been done before and a summary of it should render valuable service to the church.

I hope that you will be able to share in this corporate study of many problems and opportunities which confront the Methodist pastor in the college or university situation.

With every good wish to you and yours, I am

Very sincerely,

H. D. Bollinger

HDB/w

APPENDIX A. ACCOMPANYING LETTER SENT TO PASTORS

PACIFIC SCHOOL OF RELIGION
1798 SCENIC AVENUE
BERKELEY 9, CALIFORNIA

January 10, 1958

Dear Friend:

I want warmly to commend the study of the problems and opportunities of the preacher in his ministry to students which you will find described in the enclosed letters from Dr. Hiel D. Bollinger and Reverend Don S. Fleming.

The study being undertaken by Don Fleming is one that can be of immense value to all Methodist ministers serving in communities where there are college students. We have had a good many studies made of the work of the Wesley and other denominational foundations and of the Y.M.C.A.'s and Y.W.C.A.'s. To the best of my knowledge this is the first thoroughgoing national study of the problems confronting those who are ministering to students as preachers in college communities.

May I urge your prompt and complete filling out of the questionnaire which is enclosed in this letter. If this questionnaire could be filled out by all of the four hundred fifty preaching ministers in Methodist student centers, it would make a great contribution not only to the Methodist ministry in college communities but to that of other denominations.

I have no question about Don Fleming's competence to handle in an authentic and creative way the material that will come into his hands through this study.

With deep gratitude to you for collaboration in this important enterprise, and with warm personal regards, I remain

Cordially yours,

Clarence P. Shedd.

Clarence P. Shedd
Professor and Director of Studies
in Religion in Higher Education

INSTRUMENT OF NATIONAL STUDY FOR THE COLLEGE OR UNIVERSITY PARISH PASTOR

Please return by March 15 in enclosed stamped envelope to the Rev. Don S. Fleming, Dept. of Religion & Higher Education, Pacific School of Religion, 1798 Scenic Ave., Berkeley, California.

Name of Church _____

City _____ State _____

Conference _____

Name and Address of Pastor filling out this document _____

_____

(Information will be kept confidential)

Number of active members on Church Roll _____

I. INSTITUTIONAL AND GENERAL DATA

1. Name of College or University to which parish is related _____

2. Please check classification of institution: a. Methodist _____
   b. State _____
   c. Independent _____
   d. Other (name it) _____

3. Number of regular (full time) students enrolled at the institution _____

4. How many Methodist-preference students on your campus? _____

5. How many of these Meth-preference students do you reach?
   a. vitally _____
   b. casually _____
   c. TOTAL _____

6. How many of these Meth-preference students are listed on your Church Roll?
   a. as regular full members _____
   b. as affiliate members _____
   c. TOTAL _____

7. What type of organized student group do you have in your church?
   (a) Wesley Foundation ____; (b) Wesley Fellowship ____; (c) none ____
   (d) Other (name it) _____

8. What is the average attendance of your college-age group at
   a. Sunday a.m. worship service _____
   b. Sunday eve youth meetings _____
   c. Sunday a.m. class or study group _____
   d. a planned recreational activity _____
   e. Other activity (name it) _____

9. Using 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 rate in order of their importance the following FUNCTIONS of the University Parish Pastor which relate to students:
   a. Preaching _____
   b. Counseling _____
   c. Teaching _____
   d. Evangelism _____
   e. Administration _____

10. What additional important functions would you list? _____
    (Please comment further on reverse side)

II. PLANT (Physical Accommodations)

1. How far is your church from the campus? _____
   a. If distant, how does this affect your student program? _____
   (Please comment further on reverse side)
2. How adequate are your physical accommodations for a student group?
   Good ____; fair ____; poor _____
3. Does your student group have a room or center it can call its own?
   Yes ___; no _____
4. Must accommodations be shared with other church groups? Yes ___; no _____
   a. If so, is this plan a success? ____; or a failure? _____
   b. Please describe the sharing agreement (comment on reverse side)

III. PROGRAM

1. Do you have a problem securing suitable adult counselors or advisers for your college age group? Yes ___; no _____
2. How are such advisers secured? (a) Student election ___; (b) volunteers ____; (c) local Board of Education ____; (d) appointed by pastor ____; (e) other? _____
3. How much training have your present advisers had for student work?
   Considerable ____; some ____; none _____
4. Would they be willing to attend a 1 week summer training or "lab" school if it could be set up on a Conference or Area scale? Yes ___; no ___; maybe ____
5. How are relations between "Town and Gown" groups in your church?
   Good ____; fair ____; poor _____

IV. PASTORAL RELATIONSHIPS

1. Do you entertain students in your home?
   Considerably ____; some ____; none _____
   a. What particular value does this entertaining have? _____
   b. Does your budget provide financial aid for this? Yes ____; no _____
   (Please comment further on reverse side)
2. How often do you sit in on your student group meetings? (during worship, discussion, planning sessions, etc.) Considerably ____; some ____; none _____
3. How many years have you served as a member of an annual Conference? _____
4. Of this time how many years have you served a campus-related-parish? _____
5. How many campus-related-parish churches have you served? _____
6. What graduate degrees do you hold? Masters ____; B.D. ____; other _____
7. Have you had formal training for student work? _____
   (Please comment on reverse side)
8. Have you attended a summer credit course for university parish pastors such as offered at Garrett, Perkins, USC, Candler, etc? Yes ___; no _____
   a. Would you be willing to attend such a 5 weeks course? Yes ___; no _____

V. FUNCTIONS OF THE UNIVERSITY PARISH PASTOR RELATING TO STUDENTS:

1. Preaching

(1) Using 1, 2, 3, 4, etc., please rate in order of importance the following types of sermons which you preach to your Sunday a.m. congregations:

a. Life situation ____
b. Expository ____
c. Textual ____
d. Doctrinal ____
e. Bible-centered ____
f. Others (Name them) _____

(2) How much do you slant sermons at student life and student problems?
Considerably ____; some ____; none ____

(3) How much direct relationship have you discovered between your preaching and the number of students who seek you out for personal counseling?
Considerable ____; some ____; none ____

(4) How often do you use illustrations from campus life in preaching?
Considerably ____; some ____; none ____

(5) Do you use campus phraseology and "jargon" in your sermons?
Considerably ____;;some ____; none ____
a. If so, do students react favorably? ____; unfavorably? ____
b. Do you have any comment to make on this? (use reverse side)

(6) Have you found value in "block-preaching" to students on Sunday mornings? (i.e., preaching specifically to students on special days or seasons like Orientation-enrollment week, Homecoming, Student Day, Graduation, etc.)
Considerable ____; some ____; none ____

(7) Or is your preaching continually slanted at an average Sunday morning congregation with only an occasional reference to students present?
Considerably ____; some ____; none ____

(8) Do you find students critical of preaching?
Considerably ____; some ____; none ____
(Please use reverse side of this sheet for further comment)

(9) How much would a student rather take part in a discussion himself than listen to a formal sermon? Considerably ____; some ____; none ____

(10) Is your pulpit open upon occasion to visiting pulpit guests who are "student speakers" or able pulpiteers of some recognition? Yes____; no ____
a. If so, how many such "guests" preached for you last year? ____
b. Do you have a budget-item for honoraria for them? Yes___; no ____

(11) How do students react to such speakers?
Favorably____; unfavorably____; indifferently____

(Use reverse side for further comment on any of the above questions)

V. FUNCTIONS of the University Parish Pastor relating to students (continued):

2. Counseling

(1) Do you believe there is (or should be) a direct relationship between pulpit preaching and your personal counseling with individual students?
Considerable ____; some ____; none ____

(2) Do you publish definite hours when you are available for counseling?
Yes___; no ____

(3) About how many hours per week do you spend counseling students? ____

(4) About what percentage of your counseling with students results from your following activities?

a. Preaching ____
b. Participating in student activities ____
c. Personal calling on students ____
d. Casual encounter ____
e. Just by being available ____
f. Other ways (name them _____

(5) In what particular ways do you seek to create counseling situations by establishing intimate personal relations with individual students_____
(Please comment on reverse side)

(6) What method of counseling do you think works best with students?
(Using 1, 2, 3, rate one or more of the following in order of best results)

a. Non-directive or reflective method ____
b. Giving advice out of your experience ____
c. Just listening ____
d. Combination of several methods ____
e. Some other method? (name it)_____
(Please use reverse side for further comment)

(7) Using 1, 2, 3, 4, etc., please rate in order of importance the following problem areas of student concern:

a. Emotional problems ____
b. Vocational problems ____
c. Educational problems ____
d. Social problems ____
e. Health problems ____
f. Economic problems ____
g. Moral & spiritual problems____
h. Marriage & family problems____
i. Alcohol ____
j. Other(s) name them_____
(Please use reverse side for further comment)

(8) Do you refer students who may be in need of professional psychiatric or psychological treatment? Considerably ____; some ____; none ____

(9) Have you had any special training (other than your own reading) which adds aids you to recognize symptoms indicating a need for professional referral? (i.e., simple and/or pronounced neuroses, psychoses, hysteria, depression, paranoia, etc., and a general knowledge of the emotional problems which are characteristic of later adolescence or college-age youth?)
Considerable ____; some ____; none ____

a. If so, what training? (Comment on reverse side)

(10) Have you done clinical counseling under supervision? Yes. ____No____

a. If so, please describe on reverse side.

V. FUNCTIONS of the University Parish Pastor relating to students (continued):

3. Teaching

(1) Does any parish pastor in your community teach a course(s) in religion for which students receive regular academic credit? Yes ___; No _____

a. If so, state which pastors are teaching what courses and describe their arrangement with the administration for such teaching _____

_____

(Please use reverse side for further comment)

(2) Do you teach any kind of a student class or group? Yes ___; No _____

a. If so, what kind of a class or group? _____

_____

(Please use reverse side for further comment)

(3) Does your local church provide a "laboratory-experience" for training students in churchmanship so that they will be able to make an active contribution to Kingdom work when they return to their home communities?

Yes ___ No _____

(4) Does your local church offer teacher-training courses (or co-operate with a united effort) in which your students participate? Yes ___ No _____

(5) How much do your college students participate in the following activities?

a. Church School teaching Considerably__; some ___; none_____
b. Substitute teaching Considerably__; some___; none_____
c. Church School officer Considerably__; some___; none _____
d. Singing in chancel choir Considerably__; some___; none_____
e. Ushering Considerably__; some___; none _____
f. Taking part in Sunday a.m. worship services
Considerably__; some___; none_____
g. Other activities (name them)_____

(Please use reverse side for further comments)

(6) How many college students on your Official Board? _____

a. In what other capacities than president of student group? _____
(Name them)_____

(7) How much fundamental knowledge of the principles of Religious Education and Psychology of Religion do you feel is needed by the University Parish Pastor? Considerable____; some ____; none _____

(8) How much fundamental knowledge of the dynamics and principles of general progressive education do you feel is needed by the University Parish Pastor? Considerable____; some____; none _____

(9) Have you lately had any complaints on legal grounds from any student, faculty member, or community person regarding any religious activity of any kind carried on at the campus of your School? Yes____ No _____

a. If so, were the objections raised several times? Yes____No _____
b. Please describe this complaint and what happened concerning it.

_____

_____

(Please comment further on reverse side)

V. FUNCTIONS of the University Parish Pastor relating to students (continued):

4. Evangelism (and Membership)

(1) During registration week does your School secure information regarding the religious preference of all students? Yes ___; No _____

a. Is this information easily available? Yes___; No _____
b. Or do Churches have to "struggle" to get it in time? Yes___; No _____

(2) Do you use the W.S.C.S. Student-secretary setup for follow-up on new Methodist student-preference registrations? Yes___; No _____

a. Please evaluate the strength & weakness of this plan
(Please comment on reverse side)

(3) How much do you encourage students to become members of your Church?
Considerably ____; some____; None _____

(4) What form of membership affiliation do you encourage for students?
a. Full membership ____; (b) affiliate membership____; (c) both _____

(5) Using 1, 2, 3, etc., please rate in order of importance the following types of Evangelism as suited to college students:

a. Mass evangelism (revivalism ___ d. University Christian Mission__
b. Lay visitation by students _____ e. "Win-my-chum" tactics _____
c. Personal, continuous, all-out witnessing in campus life _____
(Please comment further on reverse side)

(6) Which of the following time-emphases do you prefer for evangelism as it relates to students? a. Concentrated at special periods _____
b. Continuous emphasis _____
c. A combination of a & b _____
d. Any other emphasis (name it)_____

(7) Does your School offer a Religious Emphasis Week (or some similar religious activity) on your campus annually? Yes___; no _____

(8) How much systematic lay-visitation of students does your group do?
Considerable ____; some____; none _____

(9) How much place for "revivalism" is there in student evangelism?
Considerable ____; some____; none _____

(10) Do we need a "moral equivalent" for yesteryear's revivalistic and soul-winning witnessing for Christ among students? Yes____; No_____

(11) Do you think the final word has been spoken regarding the method of student witnessing or evangelism on the campus? Yes____ No _____
(Please comment further on reverse side)

(12) How many foreign students on your campus? _____

a. From how many countries ? _____
b. Does your local Church have any active program besides Sunday worhsip services and regularly scheduled Youth activities which includes these foreign students? Yes____; No_____
c. If so, please describe this program on reverse side.

V. FUNCTIONS of the University Parish Pastor relating to students (continued):

5. Administration

(1) Does your local Church have a Campus Relations Committee as defined in paragraph 1365 of the 1956 Methodist Discipline? Yes____; No_____

a. If not, do you have some other form of student-relation committee? Yes____; No_____

b. Please describe its composition & functions on reverse side.

(2) Does your group have a participating relationship with the following?

a. Methodist Student Movement Yes____; No_____

b. World's Student Christian Federation Yes____; No_____

c. United Student Christian Council? Yes____; No_____

d. The Conference Board of Education? Yes____; No_____

e. The Inter-Conference Commission on Student Work? Yes____; No_____

(3) Does your student work receive funds from outside the local church budget? Yes____; No_____

a. If so, from what source?_____

b. How much is the annual budget of your student group?_____

(4) How much responsibility for the financing of your student program falls your shoulders as pastor? Considerable ____; some ____; none _____
(Please comment further on reverse side)

(5) How much responsibility for Public Relations regarding student work falls on your shoulders as pastor? Considerable ____; some ____; none _____

(6) How much do you keep in touch with the Department of College and Religious Life of the Board of Education at Nashville?
Considerably____; some____; none _____

(7) Do you have an organization of Methodist faculty members? Yes___ no____

(8) Do you have an interdenominational Faculty Christian Fellowship on your campus? Yes ____; No_____

a. If not, would you consider helping to organize it? Yes____; No_____

(9) Is there a united Protestant student group on your campus? Yes___; No____

a. If so, how much do you participate in it?
Considerably ____; some ____; none _____

(10) Is there an Inter-Faith group (Cath., Prot., Jew) on your campus? Yes____; No_____

a. If so, do you participate? Considerably____; some ____; none _____

(11) How much have you been able to serve as a "middleman" in synthesizing religion and the various academic disciplines of higher education on your campus? Considerably ____; some ____; none _____

(12) Should appointment to a University Parish Pastorate receive consideration by the Bishop and Cabinet as a "special calling?" Yes____; No_____

(13) When a pastor trains for a University Parish pastorate and does an acceptable job, should he expect reasonable "security" or status in such a type of appointment under our Methodist system? Yes___; No_____

X X X

APPENDIX B. LETTER ENCLOSED WITH SECOND MAILING OF QUESTIONNAIRE

DON S. FLEMING
MINISTER
203 CHURCH ST.
GA 3-5300

First Methodist Church
207 CHURCH STREET
SANTA CRUZ, CALIFORNIA
GA 3-7986

528

BAILEY G. LIPSKY
ASSOCIATE MINISTER
205½ OCEANVIEW AVE.
GA 6-3851

April 29, 1959

Dear Fellow Pastor
in the College or University Parish:

HOW CAN I SERVE STUDENTS BETTER?

Just one year ago I sent you a letter asking this question. I asked the same question of all the 450 of our Methodist preaching pastors in the nation who serve parishes which are related in some way to student life.

Enclosed was an instrument of study, with the prayer that through mutual sharing we might all come up with some good answers to student problems that perplex us.

You will remember that this study was to go forward under the direction of our own HIEL BOLLINGER, of the Department of Student Life at Nashville, as well as Dr. CLARENCE P. SHEDD, former professor of Religion in Higher Education at Yale, and now of the Pacific School of Religion.

You will also remember that I promised you a summary of findings when they become available.

A fine lot of the questionnaires were returned---many with factual information which indicates that our brethern in college situations are really wrestling with the challenges of student life.

They reveal an amazing number of needs which appear to be mutual, but we are all grappling with them in different ways. WHAT IF SOME OF US DON'T FIND THE RIGHT ANSWERS?

A survey of those questionnaires which were returned also reveals that this study is a sound one, and that through its completion MUCH HELPFUL INFORMATION TO YOU AS A UNIVERSITY PARISH PASTOR MAY BECOME AVAILABLE. Dr. Shedd, who is directing this study with me, concurs.

BUT----until I get returns on a few more instruments the study cannot be factual, and will, therefore, become meaningless.

Of the 450 university parish pastors contacted we have heard from 181. (And some raally knocked themselves out to get them back).

We have heard from men in every state, BUT IT WILL TAKE A FEW MORE RETURNS FROM YOUR AREA, among others, BEFORE WE CAN CALL IT GOOD ENOUGH TO GO AHEAD.

May I therefore lay this matter on your heart as a fellow Methodist pastor?

It does take a little time to fill out the forms, but I am betting fifty bucks in hard earned cash (which it takes to mail out these second requests) that you will come through.

Time is of the essence, so try to get at it today. Experience teaches me that if I let a thing like this go for more than a week, its chances for borning are dead.

Thanks again,

Don S. Fleming

APPENDIX C. LETTER ENCLOSED WITH SPOT-CHECK SAMPLING OF "NO-RETURNS"

DON S. FLEMING
MINISTER
203 CHURCH ST.
GA 3-5300

First Methodist Church
207 CHURCH STREET
SANTA CRUZ, CALIFORNIA
GA 3-7986

BAILEY G. LIPSKY
ASSOCIATE MINISTER
205½ OCEANVIEW AVE.
GA 6-3851

February 10, 1960

Dear Sir and Brother:

Some time ago I mailed a questionnaire to 427 Methodist Pastors in the United States who are preaching in parishes which minister to college or University students. It was my prayer that the returned questionnaires would form an acceptable instrument for the discovery of answers to the important question, "HOW CAN I SERVE STUDENTS BETTER?"

Response was good, but yours was not received.

However, you can still help.

I did receive enough replies to make a fair study; but to make the study more reliable I am sending this letter of friendyl inquiry to one in five of the "no-returns" for a sampling of pastors and churches who did not respond.

Would you please write me a brief letter and explain as best you can WHY you did not return the questionnaire? (Whatever your explanation, it will be acceptable--and helpful.) A stamped return-envelope is enclosed.

THEN,--if you have time to complete the check list at the bottom of this sheet and the information desired on page two, it would be greatly appreciated.

Would you please at least send the note of explanation;--include the rest if possible.

YOUR EARLY REPLY WILL BE VERY HELPFUL, AND NEARLY AS IMPORTANT AS THE RETURN OF THE ORIGINAL QUESTIONNAIRE.

And I shall be pleased to send you a summary of the total findings when they become available.

Sincerely yours,

Don S. Fleming

Don S. Fleming

P.S. No 1. Check items below which apply:

(1) I did return the questionnaire. . . . ____
(2) I did not receive it. . . . . ____
(3) I handed it to an associate . . . . . ____
(4) I was too busy to return it . . . . . ____
(5) I fully intended to return it, but put it aside, and it got lost . . . . ____
(6) This study has so many ramifications that it is futile. . . . . ____

P.S, No. 2. Please check over-items on page two.

APPENDIX C. FINAL QUESTIONNAIRE FOR SAMPLING OF "NO-RETURNS"

A QUICK SUMMARY OF IMPORTANT DATA

Name of Church _____ City _____ State _____

Conference _____ Jurisdiction _____

Name and Address of pastor filling out this document (information confidential)

_____
(name) (address)

1. Number of active members on your Church Roll? _____

2. Name of College or University to which your parish is related _____

3. Please check classification of institution:
   a. Methodist _____
   b. State _____
   c. Independent _____
   d. Other (name it) _____

4. Number of full time students enrolled at the institution _____

5. How many Methodist-preference students on your campus? _____

6. How many of these Meth-preference students do you reach
   a. vitally _____
   b. casually _____
   c. TOTAL _____

7. How many of these Meth-preference students are listed on your Church roll?
   a. as regular members? _____
   b. as affiliate members? _____
   c. TOTAL _____

8. What type of organized student group do you have in your church?
   a, Wesley Foundation ___; b, Wesley Fellowship ___; c, none _____
   d, Other? (name it) _____

9. How far is your church from the campus? _____

10. How many years have you served as a member of an annual conference? _____

11. Of this time how many years have you served a campus-related church? _____

12. How many campus-related churcheshave you served (including this one?) _____

13. What graduate degrees do you hold? B.D. ____; Masters ____; other _____

14. Using 1,2,3,4,5 rate in order of their importance the following FUNCTIONS of the University Parish Pastor as they relate to students:
   a. Preaching _____
   b. Counseling _____
   c. Teaching _____
   d. Evangelism _____
   e. Administration _____

(NOTE: The above is to be checked by preaching pastors only)

T H E U N I V E R S I T Y P A R I S H P A S T O R

A National Study of the Functions of the Preaching Pastor
At a College or University Methodist Church
As They Relate to Student Life in
The United States

Abstract of a Dissertation

Submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements

For the degree of Doctor of Theology

PACIFIC SCHOOL RELIGION

by

Donald Swarthout Fleming
B.A. (Oklahoma City University), 1928
B.D. (Garrett Biblical Institute), 1931
Th.M. (Berkeley Baptist Divinity School) 1952

Department: Religion in Higher Education

Major Professor: Professor Charles S. McCoy

A B S T R A C T

The purpose of this study is to study the role and the functions of the university parish pastor as he relates to student life of colleges and universities in the United States, and through such an enquiry to discover how the ministry of this pastor might be enhanced in the service of the university community. Although the study is primarily concerned with Methodist ministers throughout the nation who serve in this capacity, many of the findings are applicable to the ministry of university parish pastors of the major Protestant denominations.

The study was carried on under the direction of Dr. Clarence P. Shedd, Professor emeritus of Religion in Higher Education at Yale University; and with the collaboration of Dr. Hiel D. Bollinger, of the Department of College and University Religious Life of the Board of Education of The Methodist Church.

The writer begins with the hypothesis that the prototypes or models of an "ideal" university parish pastor and a "typical" university parish pastor can be projected, that their respective performances can be compared and contrasted, and that as a result of this procedure useful information will be discovered that can help the pastor who serves such a church to increase his proficiency and the effectiveness of his ministry to student life.

The "ideal" university parish pastor is projected from the experience of the author after ten years in the field as a university parish pastor at the scene of two state universities, out of a background of wide reading in the area of Religion in Higher Education while doing two years of graduate research at the Pacific School of Religion, and

after many interviews with expert observers, fellow university parish pastors, and interested graduate students.

The "typical" university parish pastor is a composite creature who is projected as the result of the tabulation of findings of an exhaustive questionnaire which was mailed to 450 of the 636 Methodist pastors in the United States who are required to preach in a manner that is relevant to student life. There were 224 valid replies to the questionnaire, for a 53 per cent response. Areas in which the instrument attempted to "measure" what is being done by this pastor as he relates to students included the functions of (1) Preaching, (2) Counseling, (3) Teaching, (4) Evangelism, and (5) Administration.

Findings were tabulated by states and jurisdictions. Hundreds of personal comments were absorbed into the findings. The author explores the implications of the hypothesis, and as a result he derives information that is helpful to the university parish pastor as he endeavors to improve his ministry to students and to the university community.

The dissertation is illustrated with fifty-eight tables which clarify the projection of the thesis. Cross-tabulations are made in five areas of the university parish pastor's practice.

Closing evaluations and conclusions include recommendations: (1) for some functional improvements of this pastor's ministry, (2) for an extended study of Campus Evangelism, (3) for a parallel study for Junior Colleges, (4) to Methodist Bishops and Cabinets concerning the appointive system as it relates to the university parish pulpit, and (5) for the publication of a Handbook containing these findings which can be put into the hands of pastors who are appointed to university parish posts in the future.

A U T O B I O G R A P H Y

Donald Swarthout Fleming

On December 8, 1906, at Constantine, Michigan, I was born into a parsonage home. My father was a Methodist minister, and my mother, my brother and I were destined to be ordained as preachers of the Gospel. At the age of twelve I felt a "call" to full time Christian service.

At the age of sixteen years my District Superintendent licensed me as a Local Preacher. The same year I was enrolled at the Oklahoma City University where I was graduated magna cum laude in 1928. During undergraduate days I was chairman of the college Y.M.C.A., won three letters in basketball, edited the college paper, was president of my social fraternity and a member of the "gospel team." Twice representing my college in Rhodes Scholarship competition, I majored in English and minored in Journalism and Modern Languages. For one year following graduation I taught school on the Junior High level, while preaching at my "student charge" on Sundays.

In 1931 I was awarded my B.D. degree in the department of Biblical Literature at Garrett Biblical Institute. Upon graduation I took an appointment in the Oklahoma Conference of the The Methodist Church where I had established an official relationship in 1925. After serving for seven years in the Oklahoma Conference I was transferred to the California Conference (now the California-Nevada Conference) where I have served six churches to date.

While pastor at Reno, Nevada, the scene of the University of Nevada, I became tremendously interested in the ministry of the university parish pastor as he relates to students. It was at this time that the idea for

the study was conceived. Following a pastorate at Berkeley, which was adjacent to the University of California, my "call" to make the study which resulted in this dissertation was confirmed. In 1957 I enrolled at the Pacific School of Religion, and after two years of acceptable residence I became a candidate for the degree of Doctor of Theology in the Department of Religion in Higher Education. I am now serving my third year as the pastor of the First Methodist Church at Santa Cruz, California.

D

GTU LIBRARY
3 2400 00587 1532

Fleming, D.
The university parish pastor
DEC 1 1963
TU18
M
XF4

GTU Library
2400 Ridge Road
Berkeley, CA 94709
For renewals call (510) 649-2500
All items are subject to recall.